arXiv:0810.5654v2 [math.SG] 23 Nov 2009

LAGRANGIAN FLOER THEORY ON COMPACT TORIC MANIFOLDS II: BULK DEFORMATIONS.

KENJI FUKAYA, YONG-GEUN OH, HIROSHI OHTA, KAORU ONO

Abstract. This is a continuation of part I in the series of the papers on Lagrangian Floer theory on toric manifolds. Using the deformations of Floer cohomology by the ambient cycles, which we call *bulk deformations*, we find a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers on some compact toric manifolds. We also provide a method of finding all those fibers in arbitrary compact toric manifolds, which we call *bulk-balanced* Lagrangian fibers.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Bulk deformations of Floer cohomology 5
3. Potential function with bulk 9
4. Elimination of higher order terms by bulk deformations 17
5. Two points blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$: an example 26
6. Operator $\mathfrak{q}$ in the toric case 28
7. Calculation of potential function with bulk 36
8. Floer cohomology and non-displacement of Lagrangian submanifolds 40
9. Domain of definition of potential function with bulk 58
10. Euler vector field 61
11. Deformation by $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$ 63
12. Appendix: Continuous family of multisections 66

References 74

Date: Nov. 2, 2009.

Key words and phrases. toric manifolds, Floer cohomology, weakly unobstructed Lagrangian submanifolds, potential function, Jacobian ring, bulk deformations, bulk-balanced Lagrangian submanifolds, open-closed Gromov-Witten invariant.

KF is supported partially by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.18104001 and by Global COE Program G08, YO by US NSF grant # 0904197, HO by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.19340017, and KO by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Nos. 18340014 and 21244002.

1. Introduction

This is the second of series of papers to study Lagrangian Floer theory on toric manifolds. The main purpose of this paper is to explore bulk deformations of Lagrangian Floer theory, which we introduced in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (=section 13 [FOOO2]) and draw its applications. In particular, we prove the following Theorems 1.1, 1.3. We call a Lagrangian submanifold L of a symplectic manifold X *non-displaceable* if $\psi(L) \cap L \neq \emptyset$ for any Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\psi : X \to X$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X_k be the k-points blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with $k \geq 2$. Then there exists a toric Kähler structure on X_k such that there exist a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers $L(u)$.*

Moreover they have the following property: If $\psi : X \to X$ is a Hamiltonian isotopy such that $\psi(L(u))$ is transversal to $L(u)$ in addition, then

$$\#(\psi(L(u)) \cap L(u)) \geq 4.$$

Remark 1.2.
(1) We state Theorem 1.1 in the case of the blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. We can construct many similar examples by the same method.
(2) We will prove Theorem 1.1 by proving the existence of $\mathfrak{b} \in H^2(X_k; \Lambda_+)$ and $\mathfrak{x} \in H(L(u); \Lambda_0)$ such that

$$HF((L(u), (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x})), (L(u), (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x})); \Lambda_0) \cong H(T^2; \Lambda_0). \tag{1.1}$$

Here

$$\Lambda_0 = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \,\middle|\, \lambda_i \geq 0, \lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_i = \infty, a_i \in R \right\}, \tag{1.2}$$

(R is a field of characteristic 0) and

$$\Lambda_+ = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \,\middle|\, \lambda_i > 0 \right\} \tag{1.3}$$

are the universal Novikov ring and its maximal ideal. The left hand side of (1.1) is the Floer cohomology with bulk deformation. See section 3.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13 [FOOO2]) and section 2 of this paper for its definition.
(3) In a sequel of this series of papers, we will study this example further and prove that the universal cover $\widetilde{Ham}(X_k)$ of the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms allows infinitely many continuous and homogeneous Calabi quasi-morphisms $\varphi_u : \widetilde{Ham}(X_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ (see [EP]) such that for any finitely many $u_1, \ldots, u_N$ there exists a subgroup $\cong \mathbb{Z}^N \subset \widetilde{Ham}(X_k)$ on which $(\varphi_{u_1}, \ldots, \varphi_{u_N}) : \mathbb{Z}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is injective.

In sections 9 and 10 [FOOO4], we introduced the notion of leading term equation for each Lagrangian fiber $L(u)$ of a toric manifold X. See also section 4 of this paper. The leading term equation is a system consisting of n-elements of the Laurent polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[y_1, \ldots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \ldots, y_n^{-1}]$ of n variables. (Here $n = \dim L(u)$.) In section 10 [FOOO4], we proved that if the leading term equation has a solution in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})^n$ then $L(u)$ has a nontrivial Floer cohomology for some bounding cochain $\mathfrak{x}$ in $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0)$ *under certain nondegeneracy conditions*. The next theorem says that if we consider more general class of Floer cohomology integrating bulk deformations into its construction, we can remove this nondegeneracy condition.

Theorem 1.3. *Let X be a compact toric manifold and $L(u)$ its Lagrangian fiber. Suppose that the leading term equation of $L(u)$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})^n$.*

Then there exists $\mathfrak{b} \in H^2(X;\Lambda_+)$ and $\mathfrak{x} \in H(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ satisfying

$$HF((L(u),(\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x})),(L(u),(\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}));\Lambda_0) \cong H(T^n;\Lambda_0). \tag{1.4}$$

We remark that it is proved in [FOOO4] that there always exists u such that the leading term equation of $L(u)$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})^n$.

Corollary 1.4. *Let X be a compact toric manifold and $L(u)$ its Lagrangian fiber. Suppose that the leading term equation of $L(u)$ has a solution in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})^n$. Then $L(u)$ is non-displaceable.*

Moreover $L(u)$ has the following property. If $\psi : X \to X$ is a Hamiltonian isotopy such that $\psi(L(u))$ is transversal to $L(u)$, then

$$\#(\psi(L(u)) \cap L(u)) \geq 2^n, \tag{1.5}$$

where $n = \dim L(u)$.

The converse to Theorem 1.3 also holds. (See Theorem 4.7.)

The leading term equation can be easily solved in practice for most of the compact toric manifolds, which are not necessarily Fano. Theorem 1.3 enables us to reduce the problem to locate all $L(u)$ such that there exists a pair $(\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}) \in H^2(X;\Lambda_+) \times H(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ satisfying (1.4) to the problem to decide existence of nonzero solution of explicitly calculable system of polynomial equations. In [FOOO4] we provided such a reduction for the case $\mathfrak{b} = 0$. If all the solutions of the leading term equation are weakly nondegenerate (see Definition 10.2 [FOOO4]), Floer cohomology with $\mathfrak{b} = 0$ seems to provide enough information for the general study of non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers. The method employed in this paper works for arbitrary compact toric manifolds without nondegeneracy assumption, and the calculation is actually simpler. We hope that this method might provide an optimal result on the non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers. (See Problems 3.16 & 3.20.)

Remark 1.5. In [Cho], Cho used Floer cohomology with 'B-field' to study non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers in toric manifolds. 'B-field' which Cho used is parameterized by $H^2(X;\sqrt{-1}\,\mathbb{R})$. The bulk deformation we use in this paper is parameterized by $\mathfrak{b} \in H^*(X;\Lambda_0)$. If we restrict to $\mathfrak{b} \in H^2(X;\sqrt{-1}\,\mathbb{R})$ our bulk deformation by $\mathfrak{b}$ in this paper coincides with the deformation by a 'B-field' in [Cho].

A brief outline of each section of the paper is now in order. In section 2, we review construction of the operator $\mathfrak{q}$ given in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (=section 13 [FOOO2]) and explain how we use $\mathfrak{q}$ to deform Floer cohomology. In section 3 we provide a more explicit description thereof for the case of compact toric manifolds and study its relation to the potential function with bulk, which is the generating function defined by the structure constants of $\mathfrak{q}$. This section also contains various results on the operator $\mathfrak{q}$ and on the potential function with bulk. These results will be used also in sequels of this series of papers. In section 4, we explain how we use the results of section 3 to study Floer cohomology of Lagrangian fibers of compact toric manifolds. Especially we prove Theorem 1.3 there. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. In this section we discuss the case of two points blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ in detail. The calculation we perform in this section can be generalized to arbitrary compact toric manifolds. In section 6 we describe the results on the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic discs with boundary on a Lagrangian fiber of a general toric manifold, which are basically due to [CO]. We use these results in the study of the operator $\mathfrak{q}$. In section 7 we carry out some calculation of the potential function with bulk deformation which is strong enough to locate all the Lagrangian fibers with nontrivial Floer cohomology (after bulk deformation).

In section 8 we use the Floer cohomology with bulk deformation in the study of non-displacement of Lagrangian submanifolds. For this purpose we define the cohomology between a pair of Lagrangian submanifolds L and $\psi(L)$ for a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism ψ. We also show that this Floer cohomology of the pair is isomorphic to the Floer cohomology of L itself. This is a standard process one takes to use Floer cohomology for the non-displacement problem dating back to Floer [Fl]. We include bulk deformations and deformations by bounding cochain there. These results were previously obtained in [FOOO3]. However we give rather detailed account of these constructions here in order to make this paper as self-contained as possible. To avoid too much overlap with that of [FOOO3], in this paper we give a proof using the de Rham cohomology version here which is different from that of [FOOO3] in which we used the singular cohomology version. In section 9 we study the convergence property of potential functions. Namely we prove that the potential function is contained in the completion of the ring of Laurent polynomials over a Novikov ring with respect to an appropriate non-Archimedean norm. This choice of the norm depends on the Kähler structure (or equivalently to the moment polytope). We discuss the natural way to take completion (in section 3) and show that our potential function actually converges in that sense (in section 9). In section 10, we discuss the relation of Euler vector fields and the potential function. In section 11, we slightly enlarge the parameter space of bulk deformations including $\mathfrak{b}$ from $H(X;\Lambda_0)$ not just from $H(X;\Lambda_+)$. In section 12, we review the construction of smooth correspondence in de Rham cohomology using continuous family of multisections and integration along fibers via its zero sets.

Notations and conventions

We take any field R containing $\mathbb{Q}$. The universal Novikov ring Λ_0 is defined as (1.2), where $a_i \in R$. Its ideal Λ_+ is defined as (1.3).

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \,\Big|\, a_i \in R, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, \, \lambda_i < \lambda_{i+1}, \, \lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_i = \infty \right\}$$

is the field of fraction of Λ_0.

In case we need to specify R we write $\Lambda_0(R)$, $\Lambda_+(R)$, $\Lambda(R)$. The (non-Archimedean) valuation $\mathfrak{v}_T$ on them are defined by

$$\mathfrak{v}_T\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i}\right) = \inf\{\lambda_i \mid a_i \neq 0\}.$$

It induces a non-Archimedean norm $\|x\| = e^{-\mathfrak{v}_T(x)}$ and defines a topology on them. Those rings are complete with respect to this norm.

If C is an R vector space, we denote by $C(\Lambda_0)$ the completion of $C \otimes \Lambda_0$ with respect to the non-Archimedean topology of Λ_0. In other words its elements are of the form

$$\sum a_i T^{\lambda_i}$$

such that $a_i \in C$, $\lambda_i < \lambda_{i+1}$, $\lambda_i \ge 0$, $\lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_i = \infty$. $C(\Lambda_+)$, $C(\Lambda)$, $C(\Lambda_0(R))$, $C(\Lambda_+(R))$, $C(\Lambda(R))$ are defined in the same way.

We denote by (X,ω) the compact toric manifold, with Kähler form ω given. $\pi : X \to P$ is the moment map, where $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We write the vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing P by $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Its dual space is denoted by $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. $L(u)$ is a fiber $\pi^{-1}(u)$ where $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$. We define an $\mathbb{R}$ linear isomorphism

$$H_1(L(u);\mathbb{R}) \to N_{\mathbb{R}} \tag{1.6}$$

as follows. Let $\vec{f} \in H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$. The moment map of the action of

$$S^1 = \vec{f}\mathbb{R} \mod H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z}) \subset H_1(L(u);\mathbb{R})/H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z}) = T^n$$

is denoted by $\mu_{\vec{f}}$. $\mu_{\vec{f}}$ factors thorough $P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ so that $\mu_{\vec{f}} = \tilde{\mu}_{\vec{f}} \circ \pi$, where $\tilde{\mu}_{\vec{f}}$ is affine. We associate $d\tilde{\mu}_{\vec{f}} \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ to $\vec{f}$. This induces (1.6).

The boundary ∂P is divided into m codimension 1 faces, which we denote by $\partial_i P$ $(i = 1,\dots,m.)$ In [FOOO4], we defined affine maps $\ell_i : M_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\partial_i P = \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \ell_i(u) = 0\}, \qquad P = \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \ell_i(u) \ge 0,\ i = 1,\dots,m\}.$$

We put $\vec{v}_i = d\ell_i \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \cong H_1(L(u);\mathbb{R})$. In fact $\vec{v}_i \in H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$, i.e., $\vec{v}_i$ is an integral vector.

We denote by x_i $(i = 1,\dots,n)$ the coordinates of $H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ with respect to the basis $\mathbf{e}_i$ and put $y_i = e^{x_i}$.

2. Bulk deformations of Floer cohomology

In this section, we review the results of section 3.8 [FOOO3] (=section 13 of [FOOO2]).

Let (X,ω) be a compact symplectic manifold and L be its Lagrangian submanifold. We take a finite dimensional graded R-vector space H of smooth singular *cycles* of X. (Actually we may consider a subcomplex of the smooth singular chain complex of X and consider smooth singular *chains*. Since consideration of chain level arguments is not needed in this paper, we restrict ourselves to the case of *cycles*. See [FOOO3] and a sequel of this series of papers for relevant explanations.)

We regard an element of H as a cochain (cocycle) by identifying a k-chain with a $(2n-k)$-cochain where $n = \dim L$.

In section 3.8 [FOOO3] (=section 13 of [FOOO2]) we introduced a family of operators denoted by

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k} : E_\ell(H[2]) \otimes B_k(H^*(L;R)[1]) \to H^*(L;R)[1]. \tag{2.1}$$

Explanation of the various notations appearing in (2.1) is in order. β is an element of the image of $\pi_2(X,L) \to H_2(X,L;\mathbb{Z})$. $H[2]$ is the degree shift of H by 2 defined by $(H[2])^d = H^{d+2}$. $H^*(L;R)[1]$ is the degree shift of the cohomology group with R coefficient. The notations E_ℓ and B_k are defined as follows. Let C be a graded vector space. We put

$$B_k C = \underbrace{C \otimes \cdots \otimes C}_{k \text{ times}}.$$

The symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_k$ of order $k!$ acts on $B_k C$ by

$$\sigma \cdot (x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k) = (-1)^* x_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\sigma(k)},$$

where

$$* = \sum_{i<j;\sigma(i)>\sigma(j)} \deg x_i \deg x_j.$$

E_kC is the set of $\mathfrak{S}_k$-invariant elements of B_kC. The map (2.1) is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear map of degree $1-\mu(\beta)$ here μ is the Maslov index.

We next describe the main properties of $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}$. Let B_kC be as above and put

$$BC = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} B_kC.$$

(We remark $B_0C = R$.) BC has the structure of coassociative coalgebra with its coproduct $\Delta : BC \to BC \otimes BC$ defined by

$$\Delta(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_i) \otimes (x_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k).$$

This induces a coproduct $\Delta : EC \to EC \otimes EC$ with respect to which EC becomes a coassociative and graded cocommutative.

We also consider a map $\Delta^{n-1} : BC \to (BC)^{\otimes n}$ or $EC \to (EC)^{\otimes n}$ defined by

$$\Delta^{n-1} = (\Delta \otimes \underbrace{id \otimes \cdots \otimes id}_{n-2}) \circ (\Delta \otimes \underbrace{id \otimes \cdots \otimes id}_{n-3}) \circ \cdots \circ \Delta.$$

For an element $\mathbf{x} \in BC$, it can be expressed as

$$\Delta^{n-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_c \mathbf{x}_c^{n;1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{x}_c^{n;n}$$

where c runs over some index set depending on $\mathbf{x}$. For an element

$$\mathbf{x} = x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k \in B_k(H(L;R)[1])$$

we put the shifted degree $\deg' x_i = \deg x_i - 1$ and

$$\deg' \mathbf{x} = \sum \deg' x_i = \deg \mathbf{x} - k.$$

(Recall $\deg x_i$ is the cohomological degree of x_i before shifted.)

Theorem 2.1. (Theorem 3.8.32 [FOOO3] = Theorem 13.32 [FOOO2]) *The operators $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}$ have the following properties.*

(1) *For each β and $\mathbf{x} \in B_k(H(L;R)[1])$, $\mathbf{y} \in E_k(H[2])$, we have the following:*

$$0 = \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \sum_{c_1,c_2} (-1)^* \mathfrak{q}_{\beta_1}(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{2;1}; \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{3;1} \otimes \mathfrak{q}_{\beta_2}(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{2;2}; \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{3;2}) \otimes \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{3;3}) \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$* = \deg' \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{3;1} + \deg' \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{3;1} \deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{2;2} + \deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{2;1}.$$

In (2.2) and hereafter, we write $\mathfrak{q}_\beta(\mathbf{y};\mathbf{x})$ in place of $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}(\mathbf{y};\mathbf{x})$ if $\mathbf{y} \in E_\ell(H[2])$, $\mathbf{x} \in B_k(H(L;R)[1])$.

(2) *If $1 \in E_0(H[2])$ and $\mathbf{x} \in B_k(H(L;R)[1])$ then*

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;0,k}(1;\mathbf{x}) = \mathfrak{m}_{\beta;k}(\mathbf{x}). \tag{2.3}$$

Here $\mathfrak{m}_{\beta;k}$ is the filtered A_∞ structure on $H(L;R)$.

(3) *Let* $\mathbf{e} = PD([L])$ *be the Poincaré dual to the fundamental class of* L. *Let* $\mathbf{x}_i \in B(H(L;R)[1])$ *and we put* $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e} \otimes \mathbf{x}_2 \in B(H(L;R)[1])$. *Then*

$$\mathfrak{q}_\beta(\mathbf{y};\mathbf{x}) = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

except the following case.

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\beta_0}(1;\mathbf{e}\otimes x) = (-1)^{\deg x}\mathfrak{q}_{\beta_0}(1;x\otimes \mathbf{e}) = x, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\beta_0 = 0 \in H_2(X,L;\mathbb{Z})$ *and* $x \in H(L;R)[1] = B_1(H(L;R)[1])$.

Theorem 2.1 is proved in sections 3.8 and 7.4 of [FOOO3] (= sections 13 and 32 of [FOOO2]). We will recall its proof in section 7 in the case when X is a toric manifold, $R = \mathbb{R}$ and L is a Lagrangian fiber of X.

We next explain how we use the map $\mathfrak{q}$ to deform filtered A_∞ structure $\mathfrak{m}$ on L. In this section we use the universal Novikov ring

$$\Lambda_{0,nov} = \left\{\sum c_i T^{\lambda_i} e^{n_i} \,\middle|\, c_i \in R, \lambda_i \ge 0, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_i = +\infty\right\}$$

which was introduced in [FOOO1]. We write $\Lambda_{0,nov}(R)$ in case we need to specify R. The ideal $\Lambda_{0,nov}^+$ of $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ is the set of all elements $\sum c_i T^{\lambda_i} e^{n_i}$ of $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ such that $\lambda_i > 0$. We put $F^\lambda\Lambda_{0,nov} = T^\lambda\Lambda_{0,nov}$. It defines a filtration on $\Lambda_{0,nov}$, under which $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ is complete. $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ becomes a graded ring by putting $\deg e = 2$, $\deg T = 0$.

We choose a basis $\mathbf{f}_a$ $(a = 1,\dots,B)$ of H and consider an element

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_a \mathfrak{b}_a \mathbf{f}_a \in H(X;\Lambda_{0,nov}^+)$$

such that $\deg \mathfrak{b}_a + \deg \mathbf{f}_a = 2$ for each a. We then define

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}(x_1,\dots,x_k) = \sum_{\beta,\ell,k} e^{\mu(\beta)/2} T^{\omega\cap\beta/2\pi} \mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}(\mathfrak{b}^{\otimes \ell}; x_1,\dots,x_k). \tag{2.6}$$

Here $\mu : \pi_2(X,L) \to \mathbb{Z}$ is the Maslov index.

Lemma 2.2. *The family* $\{\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ *defines a filtered* A_∞ *structure on* $H(L;\Lambda_{0,nov})$.

Proof. We put

$$e^{\mathfrak{b}} = \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty \mathfrak{b}^{\otimes \ell}.$$

Then we have

$$\Delta(e^{\mathfrak{b}}) = e^{\mathfrak{b}} \otimes e^{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Lemma 2.2 follows from this fact and Theorem 2.1. (See Lemma 3.8.39 [FOOO3] =Lemma 13.39 [FOOO2] for detail.) □

Let $b \in H^1(L;\Lambda_{0,nov}^+)$. We say b is a *weak bounding cochain* of the filtered A_∞ algebra $(H(L;\Lambda_{0,nov}),\{\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}\})$ if it satisfies

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty \mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}(b,\dots,b) = cPD([L])$$

where $PD([L]) \in H^0(L;\mathbb{Q})$ is the Poincaré dual to the fundamental cycle and $c \in \Lambda_{0,nov}^+$. By a degree counting, we find that $\deg c = 2$.

We denote by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L;\Lambda_{0,nov}^+)$ the set of the pairs $(\mathfrak{b}, b)$ of elements $\mathfrak{b} \in H \otimes \Lambda_{0,nov}^+$ of degree 2 and weak bounding cochain b of $(H(L;\Lambda_{0,nov}),\{\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}\})$.

We define $\mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{b}, b)$ by the equation

$$\mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{b}, b)e = c.$$

By definition $\mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{b}, b)$ is an element of $\Lambda_{0,nov}^+$ of degree 0 i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{b}, b) \in \Lambda_+$$

where we recall (1.3) for the definition of Λ_+.

We call the map

$$\mathfrak{PO} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}^+) \to \Lambda_+$$

the potential function. We also define the projection

$$\pi : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}^+) \to H \otimes \Lambda_{0,nov}^+$$

by

$$\pi(\mathfrak{b}, b) = \mathfrak{b}.$$

Let $\mathbf{b}_1 = (\mathfrak{b}, b_1), \mathbf{b}_0 = (\mathfrak{b}, b_0) \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}^+)$ with

$$\pi(\mathbf{b}_1) = \mathfrak{b} = \pi(\mathbf{b}_0).$$

We define an operator

$$\delta^{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_0} : H(L; \Lambda_0) \to H(L; \Lambda_0)$$

of degree +1 by

$$\delta^{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_0}(x) = \sum_{k_1,k_0} \mathfrak{m}^{\mathfrak{b}}_{k_1+k_0+1}(b_1^{\otimes k_1} \otimes x \otimes b_0^{\otimes k_0}).$$

Lemma 2.3.

$$(\delta^{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_0} \circ \delta^{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_0})(x) = (-\mathfrak{PO}(\mathbf{b}_1) + \mathfrak{PO}(\mathbf{b}_0))ex.$$

Proof. This is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.1. See [FOOO3] Proposition 3.7.17 (=[FOOO2] Proposition 12.17). □

Definition 2.4. ([FOOO3] Definition 3.8.61 = [FOOO2] Definition 13.61.) For a pair of elements $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}^+)$ with $\pi(\mathbf{b}_1) = \pi(\mathbf{b}_0)$, $\mathfrak{PO}(\mathbf{b}_1) = \mathfrak{PO}(\mathbf{b}_0)$, we define

$$HF((L, \mathbf{b}_1), (L, \mathbf{b}_0); \Lambda_{0,nov}) = \frac{\operatorname{Ker}(\delta^{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_0})}{\operatorname{Im}(\delta^{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_0})}.$$

This is well defined by Lemma 2.3.

By [FOOO3] Theorem 6.1.20 (= [FOOO2] Theorem 24.24), Floer cohomology is of the form

$$HF((L, \mathbf{b}_1), (L, \mathbf{b}_0); \Lambda_{0,nov}) \cong \Lambda_{0,nov}^a \oplus \bigoplus \frac{\Lambda_{0,nov}}{T^{\lambda_i}\Lambda_{0,nov}}.$$

We call a the Betti number and λ_i the torsion exponent of the Floer cohomology.

The following is a consequence of Theorems G, J [FOOO3] (=Theorems G, J [FOOO2]) combined. (See also section 8.)

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L; \Lambda_{0,nov}^+)$ be as in Definition 2.4. Let $\psi : X \to X$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism. We assume $\psi(L)$ is transversal to L.*

1. *The order of $\psi(L) \cap L$ is not smaller than the Betti number a of the Floer cohomology $HF((L, \mathbf{b}_1), (L, \mathbf{b}_0); \Lambda_{0,nov})$.*

(2) *Let* $\{\lambda_i\}$ *be the torsion exponents of* $HF((L,\mathbf{b}_1),(L,\mathbf{b}_0);\Lambda_{0,nov})$ *and* E *be the Hofer distance of* ψ *from identity. Let* b *be the number of* λ_i *which is not smaller than* E*. Then the order of* $\psi(L)\cap L$ *is not smaller than* $a+2b$*.*

3. Potential function with bulk

In this section, we specialize the story of the last section to the case of toric fibers, and make the construction of section 3.8 [FOOO3] (=section 13 [FOOO2]) explicit in this case. We also generalize the results from section 13 [FOOO4] and the story between Floer cohomology and the potential function to the case with bulk deformations.

Let X be a compact toric manifold and P its moment polytope. Let $\pi : X \to P$ be the moment map. For each face (of arbitrary codimension) P_a of P we have a complex submanifold $D_a = \pi^{-1}(P_a)$ for $a = 1,\dots,B$. We enumerate P_a so that the first m P_a's correspond to the m codimension one faces of P. Here we note that the complex codimension of D_a is equal to the real codimension of P_a. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the free abelian group generated by D_a. (In this paper we do not consider the case when $P_a = P$.) It is a graded abelian group $\mathcal{A} = \oplus_\ell \mathcal{A}_\ell$ with its grading given by the (real) dimension of D_a. We put $D = \pi^{-1}(\partial P) = \cup_a D_a$, that is, the toric divisor of X. We denote

$$\mathcal{A}^k(\mathbb{Z}) := \mathcal{A}_{2n-k}.$$

We remark that $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ is nonzero only for even ℓ and so $\mathcal{A}^k$ is nonzero for even k. The homomorphism : $\mathcal{A}_{2n-k} \to H_{2n-k}(X;\mathbb{Z})$ and the Poincaré duality induce a surjective homomorphism

$$i_! : \mathcal{A}^k(\mathbb{Z}) \to H^k(X;\mathbb{Z})$$

for $k \neq 0$. We remark that $i_!$ is not injective. For example $\mathcal{A}^2(\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$ (where m is the number of irreducible components of D) and $H^2(X;\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^{m-n}$. In fact we have the exact sequence

$$0 \to H_2(X;\mathbb{Z}) \to H_2(X, X\setminus D;\mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(X\setminus D;\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \to 0.$$

On the other hand, since $H_2(N(D);\partial N(D)) \cong H^{2n-2}(N(D)) \cong H^{2n-2}(D)$, (where $N(D)$ is a regular neighborhood of D in X) we have $H_2(X, X\setminus D;\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}^m \cong \mathcal{A}^2(\mathbb{Q})^*$.

We denote the set of Λ_+-cycles by $\mathcal{A}^k(\Lambda_+) = \mathcal{A}^k \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \Lambda_+$. The following is a generalization of Proposition 4.3 [FOOO4].

Proposition 3.1. *We have the canonical inclusion*

$$\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+) \times H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+) \hookrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L(u)).$$

Proposition 3.1 will be proved in section 7. We remark that the map $i_! : \mathcal{A}^k(\mathbb{Z}) \to H^k(X;\mathbb{Z})$ is not injective. Therefore, the gauge equivalence relation (See Definition 4.3.1 [FOOO3] = Definition 16.1 [FOOO2].) on the left hand side is nontrivial. So the right hand side is not $\mathcal{M}_{\text{weak,def}}(L(u))$, the set of gauge equivalence classes of the elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{weak,def}}(L(u))$.

For $\mathfrak{b} \in \bigoplus_k \mathcal{A}^k(\Lambda_+)$, $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$, we define

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}, b) : H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+) \to \Lambda_+$$

by

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}, b) = \sum_{\beta;\ell,k} T^{\omega\cap\beta/2\pi}\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}(\mathfrak{b}^{\otimes\ell}; b^{\otimes k}) \cap [L(u)]. \tag{3.1}$$

We remark that the summation on right hand side includes the term where $\ell = 0$. The term corresponding thereto is

$$\sum_{k,\beta} T^{\omega\cap\beta/2\pi}\mathfrak{m}_{\beta;k}(b^{\otimes k}) \cap [L(u)] = \mathfrak{PO}^u(b)$$

which is nothing but the potential function in the sense of section 4 [FOOO4]. Namely we have the identity

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(0, b) = \mathfrak{PO}^u(b). \tag{3.2}$$

This function (3.1) is also a special case of the potential function we discussed in section 2. (We will not use the variable e in this section.)

We put

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_a w_a[D_a], \quad b = \sum x_i\mathbf{e}_i.$$

Here $\mathbf{e}_i$ $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ is a basis of $H^1(L(u); \mathbb{Z})$. (See Lemma 4.4 [FOOO4].) We also put $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$, and $y_i = e^{x_i}$. (See the end of section 1.) We next discuss a generalization of Theorem 4.6 [FOOO4].

To state it we need some notations.

Definition 3.2. A discrete submonoid of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a subset $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

1. G is discrete.
2. If g_1, g_2 then $g_1 + g_2 \in G$. $0 \in G$.

Hereafter we say *discrete submonoid* in place of discrete submonoid of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for simplicity.

For any discrete subset $\mathfrak{X}$ of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ there exists a discrete submonoid containing it. The discrete submonoid G generated by $\mathfrak{X}$ is, by definition, the smallest one among them. We write $G = \langle\mathfrak{X}\rangle$.

Compare Condition 3.1.6 [FOOO3] (= Condition 6.11 [FOOO2]). In [FOOO3] we considered $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$. Since we do not use the grading parameter e we consider $G \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ in this paper.

Definition 3.3. Let C_i be an R vector space. We denote by $C_i(\Lambda_0)$ the completion of $C_i \otimes \Lambda_0$. Let G be a discrete submonoid.

1. An element x of $C_i(\Lambda_0)$ is said to be *G-gapped* if
$$x = \sum_{g\in G} x_g T^g$$
where $x_g \in C_i$.
2. A filtered Λ_0 module homomorphism $f : C_1(\Lambda_0) \to C_2(\Lambda_0)$ is said to be G-gapped if there exists R linear maps $f_g : C_1 \to C_2$ for $g \in G$ such that
$$f(x) = \sum_{g\in G} T^g f_g(x).$$
Here we extend f_g to $f_g : C_1(\Lambda_0) \to C_2(\Lambda_0)$ in an obvious way.

The G-gappedness of potential functions, of filtered A_∞ structures, and etc. can be defined in a similar way.

We define

$$G(X) = \langle \{\omega \cap \beta/2\pi \mid \beta \in \pi_2(X) \text{ is realized by a holomorphic sphere}\}\rangle. \tag{3.3}$$

Denote by G_{bulk} the discrete submonoid that is defined in Definition 4.13. It contains $G(X)$ as a subset.

We put

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u_0(b) = \sum_{i=1}^m T^{\ell_i(u)} y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} \tag{3.4}$$

and call it the *leading order potential function*.

Theorem 3.4. *Let X be an arbitrary compact toric manifold and $L(u)$ as above and $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)$ a G_{bulk} gapped element. Then there exist $c_\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}$, $e^i_\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\rho_\sigma \in G_{\text{bulk}}$ and $\rho_\sigma > 0$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^m e^i_\sigma > 0$ and*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; b) - \mathfrak{PO}^u_0(b) = \sum_{\sigma=1}^\infty c_\sigma y_1^{v'_{\sigma,1}} \cdots y_n^{v'_{\sigma,n}} T^{\ell'_\sigma(u)+\rho_\sigma} \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$v'_{\sigma,k} = \sum_{i=1}^m e^i_\sigma v_{i,k}, \quad \ell'_\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^m e^i_\sigma \ell_i. \tag{3.6}$$

If there are infinitely many non-zero c_σ's, we have

$$\lim_{\sigma\to\infty} \rho_\sigma = \infty. \tag{3.7}$$

Theorem 3.4 is proved in section 7. (3.7) slightly improves the corresponding statement in Theorem 4.6 [FOOO4].

We regard $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ as a function of w_i and y_i and write $\mathfrak{PO}^u(w_1,\dots,w_B;y_1,\dots,y_n)$. (Here $B = \sum_k \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{A}^k$.) Then Theorem 3.4, especially (3.7), implies the following:

Lemma 3.5. *The potential function*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(w_1,\dots,w_B;y_1,\dots,y_n) : (\Lambda_+)^B \times (1+\Lambda_+)^n \to \Lambda_0$$

is extended to a function $: (\Lambda_+)^B \times (\Lambda_0)^n \to \Lambda_0$.

We remark that $1+\Lambda_+$ is the set of elements $1+x \in \Lambda_0$ with $x \in \Lambda_+$. It coincides with the image of $\exp : \Lambda_+ \to \Lambda_0$. We denote the extension by the same symbol $\mathfrak{PO}^u$.

Actually, we can extend the domain of the potential function to the union

$$((\Lambda_0)^B \times (\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)) \cup ((\Lambda_+)^B \times (\Lambda_0)^n).$$

Let $w_1,\dots,w_m$ be the parameters corresponding to $\mathcal{A}^2$. (m is the number of irreducible components.) We put $\mathfrak{w}_i = e^{w_i}$ and consider the ring

$$\Lambda_0[\mathfrak{w}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{w}_m,\mathfrak{w}_1^{-1},\dots,\mathfrak{w}_m^{-1},w_{m+1},\dots,w_B,y_1,y_1^{-1},\dots,y_n,y_n^{-1}]. \tag{3.8}$$

We take its completion with respect to the norm induced by the non-Archimedean norm of Λ_0 and denote it by

$$\Lambda_0\langle\!\langle \mathfrak{w},\mathfrak{w}^{-1},w,y,y^{-1}\rangle\!\rangle.$$

In other words, its element is an infinite sum

$$\sum_k a_k\, \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_{k,1}} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_{k,m}} w_{m+1}^{e_{k,m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_{k,B}} y_1^{f_{k,1}} \cdots y_n^{f_{k,n}}$$

where $e_{k,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ $(i \le m)$, $e_{k,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ $(i > m)$, $f_{k,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a_k \in \Lambda_0$ and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathfrak{v}_T(a_k) = \infty.$$

The ring (3.8) is called a *strictly convergent power series ring*. See [BGR]. We have

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u \in \Lambda_0\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle. \tag{3.9}$$

In particular, (3.9) implies that the potential function

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathfrak{w}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_m, w_{m+1}, \dots, w_B, y_1, \dots, y_n)\\ &\mapsto \mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{w}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_m, w_{m+1}, \dots, w_B, y_1, \dots, y_n)\end{aligned}$$

is defined on $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^m \times (\Lambda_0)^{B-m} \times (\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^n$.

We can further improve (3.9) to Theorem 3.11. To make the precise statement on this we need some preparation.

First recall that P is convex and so Int$P$ is contractible. Therefore we have a T^n-bundle isomorphism

$$\Psi : \pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Int}P) \cong T^n \times \mathrm{Int}P.$$

For example we can construct such an isomorphism by first picking a reference point u_{ref} and identifying a fiber $\pi^{-1}(u_{\mathrm{ref}}) = L(u_{\mathrm{ref}})$ with T^n and then using the parallel transport with respect to the natural affine connection associated the Lagrangian smooth fibration $\pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Int}P) \to \mathrm{Int}P$. (See [W], [Dui].) Then Ψ induces a natural isomorphism

$$\psi_u := (\Psi|_{\pi^{-1}(u)})^* : H^1(T^n; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^1(L(u); \mathbb{Z}).$$

Now we choose a basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ of $H^1(T^n;\mathbb{Z})$ and x_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$ the associated coordinates. We then denote $y_i = e^{x_i}$. We note that $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ and x_i (and so y_i) depend only on T^n. Using the isomorphism ψ_u we can push-forward them to $H^1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$ which are nothing but the coordinates associated to the basis

$$\{\psi_u(\mathbf{e}_i)\}_{1\le i\le n}$$

of $H^1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$ mentioned in the end of section 1.

We denote the variable

$$y_i(u) = T^{-u_i} y_i \circ \psi_u^{-1} \tag{3.10}$$

and consider the ring

$$\Lambda[\mathfrak{w}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_m^{-1}, w_{m+1}, \dots, w_B, y_1(u), \dots, y_n(u)^{-1}].$$

By definition we have a ring isomorphism, again denoted by ψ_u,

$$\psi_u : \Lambda[\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}] \to \Lambda[\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y(u), y(u)^{-1}]; \quad y_i \mapsto T^{u_i} y_i(u).$$

Furthermore by definition, we have a ring isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{u',u} : \Lambda&[\mathfrak{w}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_m^{-1}, w_{m+1}, \dots, w_B, y_1(u), \dots, y_n(u)^{-1}]\\ &\to \Lambda[\mathfrak{w}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_m^{-1}, w_{m+1}, \dots, w_B, y_1(u'), \dots, y_n(u')^{-1}]\end{aligned}$$

given by $\psi_{u',u} = \psi_{u'} \circ \psi_u^{-1}$ or more explicitly by

$$\psi_{u',u}(y_i(u)) = T^{u'_i - u_i} y_i(u')$$

for any two u, $u' \in \mathrm{Int}P$. (Compare this discussion with the one right after Remark 6.14 [FOOO4].) Clearly $\psi_{u'',u'} \circ \psi_{u',u} = \psi_{u'',u}$.

Now we define a family of valuations $\mathfrak{v}_T^u$ parameterized by $u \in \mathrm{Int}\,P$ on the ring $\Lambda[\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}]$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathfrak{v}_T^u\left(\sum_k a_k\, \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_{k,1}} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_{k,m}} w_{m+1}^{e_{k,m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_{k,B}} y_1^{f_{k,1}} \cdots y_n^{f_{k,n}}\right)\\ &= \inf_k \{\mathfrak{v}_T(a_k) + \langle f_k, u\rangle \mid a_k \neq 0\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We note that by definition we have

$$\mathfrak{v}_T^u(y_i) = u_i. \tag{3.12}$$

We remark that $\mathfrak{v}_T^u$ is independent of the choice of the basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ of $H^1(T^n;\mathbb{Z})$.

Definition 3.6. We define a function

$$\mathfrak{v}_T^P(x) = \inf\{\mathfrak{v}_T^u(x) \mid u \in \mathrm{Int}P\}$$

on the ring $\Lambda[\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}]$ which defines a non-Archimedean valuation. We denote its completion by $\Lambda^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$. We put

$$\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle = \{x \in \Lambda^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle \mid \mathfrak{v}_T^P(x) \geq 0\}.$$

Define the variable

$$z_j(u) = T^{\ell_j(u)} y_1(u)^{v_{j,1}} \cdots y_n(u)^{v_{j,n}}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, m$.

The following lemma follows from the definition (3.10) of $y_i(u)$.

Lemma 3.7. *The expression*

$$z_j(u) \circ \psi_u \in \Lambda\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$$

is independent of $u \in \mathrm{Int}\,P$. *We denote this common variable by* z_j. *Furthermore we have*

$$\mathfrak{v}_T^u(z_j) = \ell_j(u). \tag{3.13}$$

In particular z_j *lies in* $\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ *which is defined similarly as* $\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.

Proof. From (3.10), we have $y_i(u) \circ \psi_u = T^{-u_i} y_i$. Therefore we have

$$(y_1(u)^{v_{j,1}} \cdots y_n(u)^{v_{j,n}}) \circ \psi_u = T^{-\langle v_j, u\rangle} \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{v_{j,i}}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Recalling $\ell_j(u) = \langle v_j, u\rangle - \lambda_j$, we obtain

$$z_j(u) \circ \psi_u = T^{\ell_j(u)} (y_1(u)^{v_{j,1}} \cdots y_n(u)^{v_{j,n}}) \circ \psi_u = T^{-\lambda_j} \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{v_{j,i}}$$

which shows that that $z_j(u) \circ \psi_u$ is independent of u.

We evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{v}_T^u(z_j(u) \circ \psi_u) &= \mathfrak{v}_T^u(T^{-\lambda_j} \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{v_{j,i}}) = -\lambda_j + \sum_{i=1}^m v_{j,i} \mathfrak{v}_T^u(y_i)\\ &= -\lambda_j + \sum_{i=1}^m v_{j,i} u_i = \langle v_j, u\rangle - \lambda_j = \ell_j(u)\end{aligned}$$

where we use (3.12) for the third equality and the definition of ℓ_j for the last. Finally since $\ell_j(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$ and so $\mathfrak{v}_T^P(z_j) \geq 0$, $z_j \in \Lambda_0^P\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ by definition. This finishes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3.8. We note that the variables z_j, $j = 1, \ldots, m$ depend on λ_j's (i.e. on the polytope P) and the vectors $\{v_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,m}$. Recall the latter is the set of one dimensional generators of the fan Σ associated to the toric manifold $X = X_\Sigma$ which determines the *complex structure* on X. On the other hand the moment polytope P is determined by the *symplectic structure* of X. In other words, the variables depend on both complex structure and symplectic structure.

We consider formal power series of the form

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_{k,1}} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_{k,m}} w_{m+1}^{e_{k,m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_{k,B}} z_1^{f_{k,1}} \cdots z_m^{f_{k,m}}, \tag{3.14}$$

with the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} a_k &\in \Lambda_0, \qquad \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathfrak{v}_T(a_k) = \infty, \\ e_{k,i} &\in \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & i \leq m, \\ \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} & i > m, \end{cases} \\ f_{k,j} &\in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.9. *Any formal power series of the form (3.14) is an element of the ring* $\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.

Conversely any element of $\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ *can be written in the form of (3.14).*

Proof. Suppose that a monomial

$$\xi = a\, \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_m} w_{m+1}^{e_{m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_B} y_1^{f_1} \cdots y_n^{f_n}$$

satisfies $\mathfrak{v}_T^u(\xi) \geq 0$ for all $u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P$. We have the valuation

$$\mathfrak{v}_T^u(\xi) = \mathfrak{v}_T(a) + \langle f, u\rangle.$$

Consider

$$c = \inf\{\langle f, u\rangle \mid u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P\}. \tag{3.15}$$

Since P is a convex polytope, we can take a vertex u^0 of P such that

$$\langle f, u^0\rangle = c.$$

There exist n faces $\partial_{j_i}P$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ such that

$$\{u^0\} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \partial_{j_i} P. \tag{3.16}$$

Since X is a smooth toric manifold, the corresponding fan is regular and so $\vec{v}_{j_i}$ $i = 1, \ldots, n$ forms a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of M. (See section 2.1 [Ful], for example.) Therefore we have

$$f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \vec{v}_{j_i}$$

for some $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. We choose $\vec{v}_k^* \in N = M^*$ such that

$$\langle \vec{v}_{j_i}, \vec{v}_k^* \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for any $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$, we have

$$u - u^0 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_i(u) \vec{v}_k^*$$

with $c_i(u) > 0$ for all i. And at least one $c_i(u) \to 0$ as u approaches $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \partial_{j_i} P$. By definition of c and u^0, we also have $\langle f, u \rangle \geq \langle f, u^0 \rangle$. In other words, we have

$$\langle f, u - u^0 \rangle \geq 0 \tag{3.17}$$

for all $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$. It follows that $b_i \geq 0$ for all i: Note that we have

$$\langle f, u - u^0 \rangle \to c_k(u) b_k$$

as we let $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ approach to a point $\bigcap_{i \neq k}^n \partial_{j_i} P \setminus \{u^0\}$. In fact $u \in \partial_{j_i} P$ is equivalent to $c_j(u) = 0$.

Therefore if $b_k < 0$ for some $k = 1, \ldots, n$, we would have $c_k(u) b_k < 0$ and so $\langle f, u - u^0 \rangle < 0$ for such u, a contradiction to (3.17).

And we can express

$$\xi = a T^{\langle f, u^0 \rangle} \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_m} w_{m+1}^{e_{m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_B} z_{j_1}^{b_1} \cdots z_{j_n}^{b_n} :$$

Here we use the facts that $z_i(u) = T^{\ell_i(u)} y_1(u)^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n(u)^{v_{i,n}}$, $z_i(u) \circ \psi_u = z_i$ do not depend on u and $\ell_{j_i}(u^0) = 0$ by (3.16). We have

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(a T^{\langle f, u^0 \rangle}) = \mathfrak{v}_T(a) + \langle f, u^0 \rangle = \mathfrak{v}_T(a) + c.$$

If $\mathfrak{v}_T^u(\xi) \geq 0$ for all $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$, then

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(a T^{\langle f, u^0 \rangle}) = \mathfrak{v}_T(a) + c = \inf_{u \in \operatorname{Int} P} \mathfrak{v}_T^u(\xi) \geq 0.$$

Therefore ξ is of the form (3.14).

For the converse, we first obtain

$$\mathfrak{v}_T^u(a \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_m} w_{m+1}^{e_{m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_B} z_1^{f_1} \cdots z_m^{f_m}) = \mathfrak{v}_T(a) + \sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j(u) f_j$$

from (3.13). Since $a \in \Lambda_0$, $f_j \geq 0$ and $\ell_j(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$, $\mathfrak{v}_T(a) + \sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j(u) f_j \geq 0$ for all $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ and so

$$\mathfrak{v}_T^P(a \mathfrak{w}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{e_m} w_{m+1}^{e_{m+1}} \cdots w_B^{e_B} z_1^{f_1} \cdots z_m^{f_m}) \geq 0.$$

This proves the converse and hence the proof of the lemma. □

Remark 3.10. (1) We remark that the representation (3.14) of an element $x \in \Lambda_0^P \langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1} \rangle\rangle$ is *not* unique. The non-uniqueness is due to the fact that z_i's in $\Lambda_0^P \langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1} \rangle\rangle$ satisfy the quantum Stanley-Reisner relation. (See Proposition 6.7 [FOOO4].)

(2) The proof of Lemma 3.9 implies the following: A *monomial* of the form (3.14) is a monomial in $\Lambda_0^P \langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1} \rangle\rangle$ and vice versa.

(3) The discussion above shows that the moment polytope P is closely related to the Berkovich spectrum [Ber], [KS] of $\Lambda_0^P \langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1} \rangle\rangle$.

Now we can state the following theorem whose proof will be postponed until section 9.

Theorem 3.11. *Let* $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$.

1. *The function* $\mathfrak{PO}^u \circ \psi_u$ *is independent of* u. *We denote the common function by* $\mathfrak{PO}$.
2. $\mathfrak{PO}$ *lies in* $\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}^{-1}, w, y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ *as a function on* $\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+) \times H^1(T;\Lambda_0)$.

Now we can generalize the result of section 4 [FOOO4] as follows. Using Lemma 3.5 and the idea of Cho (see section 12 [FOOO4]) we can define Floer cohomology

$$HF((L(u), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}), (L(u), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda_0)$$

for any $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}) \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0) \times H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0) \cong (\Lambda_0)^B \times (\Lambda_0)^n$. See sections 8 (the case $\mathfrak{b} \in \Lambda_+$) and 11 (the case $\mathfrak{b} \in \Lambda_0$)). The following is the generalization of Theorem 4.10 [FOOO4].

Theorem 3.12. *Let* $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}) \in (\Lambda_0)^B \times (\Lambda_0)^n$. *We assume*

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}) = 0 \tag{3.18}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. *Then we have*

$$HF((L(u_0), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}), (L(u_0), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda_0) \cong H(T^n; \Lambda_0). \tag{3.19}$$

If we assume

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}) \equiv 0 \mod T^{\mathcal{N}} \tag{3.20}$$

then we have

$$HF((L(u_0), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}), (L(u_0), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda_0/T^{\mathcal{N}}) \cong H(T^n; \Lambda_0/T^{\mathcal{N}}). \tag{3.21}$$

Theorem 3.12 will be proved in sections 8 and 11. We next define:

Definition 3.13. Let $L(u)$ be a Lagrangian fiber of a compact toric manifold (X, ω). We say that $L(u)$ is *bulk-balanced* if there exist sequences ω_i, P_i, $\mathfrak{b}_i$, $\mathfrak{x}_i$, $\mathcal{N}_i$, and u_i with the following properties.

1. (X, ω_i) is a sequence of toric manifolds such that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \omega_i = \omega$.
2. P_i is a moment polytope of (X, ω_i). It converges to the moment polytope P of (X, ω).
3. $u_i \in P_i$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i = u$.
4. $\mathfrak{b}_i \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+(\mathbb{C}))$, $\mathfrak{x}_i \in H^1(L(u_i);\Lambda_0(\mathbb{C}))$, $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$.
5. $$HF((L(u_i), \mathfrak{b}_i, \mathfrak{x}_i), ((L(u_i), \mathfrak{b}_i, \mathfrak{x}_i); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{C})/T^{\mathcal{N}_i}) \cong H(T^n; \Lambda_0(\mathbb{C})/T^{\mathcal{N}_i}).$$
6. $\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathcal{N}_i = \infty$.

Remark 3.14.

1. Definition 3.13 is related to Definitions 4.11 [FOOO4]. Namely it is easy to see that

   "Strongly balanced" ⇒ "balanced"⇒ "bulk-balanced"

   On the other hand the three notions are all different. (See Example 10.17 [FOOO4] and section 5 of the present paper.)
2. We can generalize Theorem 3.12 to the case $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0(\mathbb{C}))$ in place of $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+(\mathbb{C}))$. See section 11.

The next result is a generalization of Proposition 4.12 [FOOO4] which will be proved in section 8.

Proposition 3.15. *Suppose that $L(u) \subset X$ is bulk-balanced. Then $L(u)$ is non-displaceable.*

Moreover if $\psi : X \to X$ is a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism such that $\psi(L(u))$ is transversal to $L(u)$, then

$$\#(\psi(L(u)) \cap L(u)) \geq 2^n. \tag{3.22}$$

It seems reasonable to expect the following converse to this proposition.

Problem 3.16. Are all the non-displaceable fibers $L(u)$ of a compact toric manifold bulk-balanced?

The next definition is related to Definition 5.10 [FOOO4].

Definition 3.17. Let $L(u)$ be a Lagrangian fiber of a compact toric manifold (X, ω). The *bulk $\mathfrak{PO}$-threshold*, $\overline{\mathfrak{E}}^{\text{bulk}}(L(u))$ is $2\pi\mathcal{N}$ where $\mathcal{N}$ is the supremum of the numbers $\mathcal{N}_i$ such that there exist ω_i, P_i, $\mathfrak{b}_i$, $\mathfrak{x}_i$, and u_i satisfying Definition 3.13 (1) - (5).

Remark 3.18. In Definition 5.10 [FOOO4] we defined two closely related numbers $\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(L(u))$, $\mathfrak{E}(L(u))$. It is easy to see

$$\mathfrak{E}(L(u)) \leq \overline{\mathfrak{E}}(L(u)) \leq \overline{\mathfrak{E}}^{\text{bulk}}(L(u)). \tag{3.23}$$

The equalities in (3.23) do *not* hold in general. (See Example 10.17 [FOOO4] and section 5.)

We recall that the displacement energy $e(L)$ of a Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset X$ is the infimum of the Hofer distance $dist(\psi, id)$ between the identity map id and ψ, taken over all Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms ψ with $\psi(L) \cap L = \emptyset$. (See [H] and Definition 5.9 [FOOO4].)

We will prove the following in section 8.

Theorem 3.19.

$$e(L) \geq \overline{\mathfrak{E}}^{\text{bulk}}(L(u)). \tag{3.24}$$

It would be interesting to see if the following holds:

Problem 3.20. Does the equality hold in (3.24)?

4. Elimination of higher order terms by bulk deformations

The purpose of this section is to apply the result of the last section to locate bulk-balanced Lagrangian fibers. We first recall the notion of leading term equation. We denote by $\Lambda_0\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ the completion of the Laurent polynomial ring $\Lambda_0[y_1, y_1^{-1}, \dots, y_n, y_n^{-1}]$ with respect to the non-Archimedean norm. For each fixed $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)$ and u, we have

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \Lambda_0\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle.$$

We also put

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}(y_1, \dots, y_n) = \mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

and regard $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}$ as an element of $\Lambda_0\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.

Henceforth we write $y^{\vec{v}}$ for $y_1^{v_1} \cdots y_n^{v_n}$ with $\vec{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$.

Let $\vec{v}_i = d\ell_i = (v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n}) \in H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \cong N_{\mathbb{Z}}$ $(i = 1, \dots, m)$ as in the end of section 1. We define $S_l \in \mathbb{R}_+$ by $S_l < S_{l+1}$ and

$$\{S_l \mid l = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{L}\} = \{\ell_i(u) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}. \tag{4.1}$$

We re-enumerate the set $\{\vec{v}_k \mid \lambda_k = S_l\}$ as

$$\{\vec{v}_{l,1}, \dots, \vec{v}_{l,a(l)}\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Let $A_l^{\perp} \subset N_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ be the $\mathbb{R}$-vector space generated by $\vec{v}_{l',r}$ for $l' \le l$, $r = 1, \dots, a(l')$. We remark that $A_l^{\perp}$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Namely $A_l^{\perp} \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$ generates $A_l^{\perp}$ as an $\mathbb{R}$ vector space. Denote by K the smallest integer l such that $A_l^{\perp} = N_{\mathbb{R}}$. We put $d(l) = \dim A_l^{\perp} - \dim A_{l-1}^{\perp}$, $d(1) = \dim A_1^{\perp}$.

We remark

$$\{\vec{v}_{l,r} \mid l = 1, \dots, K, r = 1, \dots, a(l)\} \subset \{\vec{v}_i \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Henceforth we assume $l \le K$ whenever we write $\vec{v}_{l,r}$. For each (l,r) we define the integer $i(l,r) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ by

$$\vec{v}_{l,r} = \vec{v}_{i(l,r)}. \tag{4.3}$$

Renumbering $\vec{v}_i$, if necessary, we can enumerate them so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\vec{v}_i \mid i = 1, \dots, m\} \\ &= \{\vec{v}_{l,r} \mid l = 1, \dots, K, r = 1, \dots, a(l)\} \cup \{\vec{v}_i \mid i = \mathcal{K}+1, \dots, m\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

for some $1 \le \mathcal{K} \le m$ with $\mathcal{K} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{K} a(\ell)$.

Recall we have chosen a basis $\mathbf{e}_i$ of $H^1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$ in the end of section 1. It can be identified with a basis of $M_{\mathbb{R}} \cong H^1(L(u);\mathbb{R})$. Denote its dual basis on $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ by $\mathbf{e}_i^*$.

We choose a basis $\mathbf{e}_{l,s}^*$ of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\mathbf{e}_{1,1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{l,d(l)}^*$ forms a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $A_l^{\perp}$ and that each of $\vec{v}_i$ lies in $\bigoplus_{l,s} \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{e}_{l,s}^*$.

We put

$$\mathbf{e}_i^* = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \sum_{s=1}^{d(l)} a_{i;(l,s)} \mathbf{e}_{l,s}^*.$$

(Here $a_{(l,s);i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ since $\vec{v}_i$ generates $H^2(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$.) Regarding $\mathbf{e}_i^*$ and $\mathbf{e}_{l,s}^*$ as functions on $M_{\mathbb{R}}$, this equation can be written as

$$x_i = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \sum_{s=1}^{d(l)} a_{i;(l,s)} x_{l,s}$$

with $x_i = \mathbf{e}_i^*$ and $x_{l,s} = \mathbf{e}_{l,s}^*$. If we associate $y_{l,s} = e^{x_{l,s}}$, it is contained in a finite field extension of $\mathbb{Q}[y_1, y_1^{-1}, \dots, y_n, y_n^{-1}]$ and satisfies

$$y_i = \prod_{l=1}^{K} \prod_{s=1}^{d(l)} y_{l,s}^{a_{i;(l,s)}}. \tag{4.5}$$

We put $\vec{v}_{l,r} = (v_{l,r;1}, \dots, v_{l,r;n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Lemma 4.1. *The product*

$$y^{\vec{v}_{l,r}} = y_1^{v_{l,r;1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{l,r;n}}$$

is a monomial of $y_{l',s}$ *for* $l' \le l$, $s \le d(l')$.

Proof. By the definition of $A_\ell^\perp$, $\vec v_{l,r}$ is an element of $A_l^\perp$ and so

$$\vec v_{l,r} = \sum_{l' \le l, s \le d(l')} c_{l,r;l',s} \mathbf{e}^*_{l',s}$$

for some integer $c_{l,r;l',s}$. Therefore

$$y^{\vec v_{l,r}} = \prod_{l' \le l, s \le d(l')} y_{l',s}^{c_{l,r;l',s}}$$

and the lemma follows. □

We put

$$(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b})_l = \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} y^{\vec v_{l,r}}. \tag{4.6}$$

By Lemma 4.1, $(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b})_l$ can be written as a Laurent polynomial of $y_{l',s}$ for $l' \le l$, $s \le d(l')$ with its coefficients are scalars i.e., *elements of* R.

Now we consider the equation

$$y_k \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b}}{\partial y_k} = 0 \tag{4.7}$$

with $k = 1, \dots, n$ for y_k *from* Λ_0. By changing the coordinates to $y_{l,s}$ ($l = 1, \dots, K, s = 1, \dots, d(l)$), (4.7) becomes

$$y_{l,s} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b}}{\partial y_{l,s}} = 0. \tag{4.8}$$

(We recall that $y_k \frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}$ is the logarithmic derivative.) Note $a_{(l,s);i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ implies $\mathbb{Q}[y_1, y_1^{-1}, \dots, y_n, y_n^{-1}] \subset \mathbb{Q}[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{K,d(K)}, y_{K,d(K)}^{-1}]$.

Lemma 4.2. *The equation (4.8) has a solution with* $y_{l,s}$ *from* $\Lambda_0(R) \setminus \Lambda_+(R)$ *if and only if (4.7) has a solution with* $y_k \in \Lambda_0(R) \setminus \Lambda_+(R)$.

If R *is algebraically closed, then the ratio between the numbers of solutions counted with multiplicity is equal to the degree of field extension*

$$\left[\mathbb{Q}[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{K,d(K)}, y_{K,d(K)}^{-1}] : \mathbb{Q}[y_1, y_1^{-1}, \dots, y_n, y_n^{-1}]\right].$$

Proof. This is obvious from the form of the change of coordinate (4.5). □

Definition 4.3. The *leading term equation* of (4.7) or of (4.8) is the system of equations

$$\frac{\partial (\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b})_l}{\partial y_{l,s}} = 0 \tag{4.9}$$

with $y_{l,s}$ from $R \setminus \{0\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, K$, $s = 1, \dots, d(l)$.

We remark that (4.7) or (4.8) is an equation for $y_1, \dots, y_n$ or $y_{l,s}$'s in Λ_0 respectively. On the other hand, the equation (4.9) is one for $y_{l,s} \in R \setminus \{0\}$. The following lemma describes the relation between these two equations.

Lemma 4.4. *Let* $y_{l,s} \in \Lambda_0(R) \setminus \Lambda_+(R)$ *be a solution of (4.8). We define* $\overline{y}_{l,s} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ *by* $y_{l,s} \equiv \overline{y}_{l,s} \mod \Lambda_+(R)$. *Then* $\overline{y}_{l,s}$ *solves the leading term equation (4.9).*

The proof is easy. (See sections 9, 10 [FOOO4].)

We remark that the discussion above applies to the leading order potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^u_0$ (See (3.4)) without changes. See sections 9, 10 [FOOO4].

Lemma 4.5. *The leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}, y)$ *is independent of* $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)$. *Moreover it coincides with the leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}^u_0$.

Proof. The first half follows from Theorem 3.4. The second half follows from Theorem 4.6 [FOOO4]. □

We denote by $\Lambda_0\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ the completion of $\Lambda_0[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{K,d(K)}, y_{K,d(K)}^{-1}]$ with respect to the non-Archimedean norm. It is a finite field extension of $\Lambda_0\langle\langle y, y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.

Definition 4.6. We say that (X, ω) is rational if $c[\omega] \in H^2(X; \mathbb{Q})$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. We say that a Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset X$ is rational if the subgroup $\{\omega \cap \beta \mid \beta \in H_2(X, L; \mathbb{Z})\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\{0\}$.

We remark that only rational symplectic manifold (X, ω) carries a rational Lagrangian submanifold L. (In the general situation $\pi_2(X, L)$ is used sometimes in the definition of rationality of L. In our case of toric fibers, they are equivalent.)

Now we state the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.7. *The following two conditions on* u *are equivalent to each other:*

1. *The leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}^u_0$ *has a solution* $y_{l,s} \in R \setminus \{0\}$.
2. *There exists* $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+(R))$ *such that* $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}$ *has a critical point on* $(\Lambda_0(R) \setminus \Lambda_+(R))^n$.

Corollary 4.8. *If the leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}^u_0$ *has a solution then* $L(u)$ *is bulk-balanced.*

Proof of Theorem 4.7. The proof of (2) ⇒ (1) is a consequence of Lemmata 4.2, 4.4 and 4.5. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the converse.

Let $\mathfrak{y}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K)}$ be a solution of the leading term equation. We remark $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s} \in R \setminus \{0\} \subset \Lambda_0(R) \setminus \Lambda_+(R)$. We will fix $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s}$ during the proof of Theorem 4.7 and find $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s}$ is a critical point of $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}$. We also require $\mathfrak{b}$ to have the form

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} \mathfrak{b}_{l,r} D_{i(l,r)} \tag{4.10}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}_{l,r} \in \Lambda_+$. (Here and hereafter in this section we omit R in $\Lambda_+(R)$ and etc.)

Note $i(l,r) \le m$ and so $\deg D_{i(l,r)} = 2$. In other words, we use $\mathfrak{b}$ in the second cohomology $H^2(X; \Lambda_+)$ (more precisely $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}^2(\Lambda_+)$) only to prove Theorem 4.7.

We first consider the case when X is Fano. In this case we can calculate $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; y)$ explicitly as follows.

Proposition 4.9. *Suppose* X *is Fano and* $\mathfrak{b}$ *is as in* (4.10). *Then*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}, y) = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} \exp(\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}) T^{S_l} y^{\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}} + \sum_{i=\mathcal{K}+1}^{m} T^{\ell_i(u)} y^{\vec{v}_i}. \tag{4.11}$$

We will prove Proposition 4.9 in section 7.

We put

$$\vec{v}_{i(l,r)} = \sum_{l'=1}^{l} \sum_{s=1}^{d(l')} v_{l,r;l',s} \mathbf{e}^*_{l',s}, \quad \vec{v}_i = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \sum_{s=1}^{d(l)} v_{i;l,s} \mathbf{e}^*_{l,s}.$$

Lemma 4.10. *If* $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ *is a solution of the leading term equation, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{y}_{l',s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{b};\mathfrak{x}) =& \sum_{l=l'}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)}\left(\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}+\sum_{h=2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{h!}\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}^h\right)T^{S_l}v_{l,r;l',s}\mathfrak{y}^{\vec v_{i(l,r)}} \\ &+ \sum_{i=\mathcal{K}+1}^{m} v_{i;l',s}T^{\ell_i(u)}\mathfrak{y}^{\vec v_i}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Here $\mathfrak{x} = \sum(\log \mathfrak{y}_i)\mathbf{e}_i$ *and* $\mathfrak{y}_i$ *is determined from* $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s}$ *by (4.5).*

Proof. Differentiating (4.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}y_{l',s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_{l',s}} =& \sum_{l=l'}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)}\left(1+\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}+\sum_{h=2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{h!}\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}^h\right)T^{S_l}v_{l,r;l',s}y^{\vec v_{i(l,r)}} \\ &+ \sum_{i=\mathcal{K}+1}^{m} v_{i;l',s}T^{\ell_i(u)}y^{\vec v_i}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the leading term equation is

$$0 = \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} v_{l,r;l',s}\mathfrak{y}^{\vec v_{i(l,r)}}.$$

Therefore (4.12) follows. □

To highlight the idea of the proof of Theorem 4.7, we first consider the *rational* case. In this case, by rescaling the symplectic form ω to $c\omega$ by some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we may assume that ω is integral, i.e.,

$$\{\omega \cap \beta/2\pi \mid \beta \in H_2(X, L(u);\mathbb{Z})\} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

It follows that $S_l, \ell_i(u) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, we can reduce the coefficient rings from the universal Novikov rings Λ_0, Λ_+, Λ to the following rings respectively:

$$\Lambda_0^{\rm int} := R[[T]], \quad \Lambda_+^{\rm int} := TR[[T]], \quad \Lambda_0^{\rm int} := R[[T]][T^{-1}].$$

Here $R[[T]]$ is the formal power series ring.

We also consider the pairs $(\mathfrak{b}, b)$ only from $\mathcal{A}^2(\Lambda_+^{\rm int}) \times H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\rm int})$. Under these restrictions, the exponents of T appearing in the following discussion always become integers.

Lemma 4.11. *Suppose* X *is Fano and* $L(u)$ *is rational. We also assume that* $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s} \in R\setminus\{0\}$ *is a solution of the leading term equation. Then, for each* k, l, r, *there exists* $\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k) \in \Lambda_+^{\rm int}$ *such that the sum*

$$\mathfrak{b}(k) = \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)}\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k)D_{i(l,r)}$$

satisfies the equation

$$\mathfrak{y}_{l,s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_{l,s}}(\mathfrak{b}(k);\mathfrak{x}) \equiv 0 \mod T^k. \tag{4.13}$$

for $l = 1, \dots, K$, $s = 1, \dots, d(l)$. *Here* $\mathfrak{x} = \sum(\log \mathfrak{y}_i)\mathbf{e}_i$. *We also have*

$$\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k+1) \equiv \mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k) \mod T^{k-S_l}. \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. The proof is by an induction over k. If $k \le S_1$, we apply Lemma 4.10 to $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}(k) = 0$ and obtain

$$\mathfrak{y}_{l',s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{b}(k);\mathfrak{x}) \equiv 0 \mod T^{S_1}.$$

Hence (4.13) holds for $k \le S_1$.

Now suppose $k > S_1$ and assume $\mathfrak{b}(k-1)$ with the required property. By the induction hypothesis we may put

$$\mathfrak{y}_{l',s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{b}(k-1);\mathfrak{x}) \equiv T^k E_{l',s} \mod T^{k+1}, \tag{4.15}$$

for some $E_{l',s} \in R$. Let $\vec{E} = \sum E_{l',s}\mathbf{e}^*_{l',s} \in N_R = N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R$.

Sublemma 4.12. *$\vec{E}$ is contained in the vector space generated by $\{e^*_{l,s} \mid S_l < k,\ s = 1,\dots,d(l)\}$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of (4.12). ☐

By Sublemma 4.12, we can express $\vec{E}$ as

$$-\vec{E} = \sum_{S_l<k} c_{l,r}\mathfrak{y}^{\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}}\vec{v}_{i(l,r)} \tag{4.16}$$

for some $c_{l,r} \in R$. Note $\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}$, $l \le l_0$, $r \le a(l)$ span the vector space

$$A^{\perp}_{l_0} = \operatorname{span}_R\{e^*_{l,s} \mid l \le l_0,\ s = 1,\dots,d(l)\}.$$

We define $\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k)$ by

$$\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k) = \mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k-1) + c_{l,r}(\mathfrak{y}^{\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}})^{-1}T^{k-S_l}D_{i(l,r)}.$$

Since $k - S_l > 0$ it follows $k - S_l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ by the integrality hypothesis of ω. Namely $\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k) \in \Lambda^{\rm int}_+$. Therefore Lemma 4.10, (4.15) and (4.16) imply (4.13). This finishes the induction steps and so the proof of Lemma 4.11 is complete. ☐

Now we consider

$$\mathfrak{b} = \lim_{k\to\infty}\mathfrak{b}(k).$$

The right hand side converges by (4.14) and so $\mathfrak{b}$ is well-defined as an element of $\mathcal{A}(\Lambda^{\rm int}_+)$ and satisfies

$$\mathfrak{y}_{l',s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{b};\mathfrak{x}) = 0$$

as required. Thus Theorem 4.7 is proved for the case where X is Fano and $L(u)$ is rational.

We now turn to the case where X is not necessarily Fano or $L(u)$ not necessarily rational. We will still use an induction argument but we need to carefully choose the discrete submonoids of $\mathbb{R}$ to carry out the induction argument.

Let $G(X)$ be as in (3.3). We define:

$$\begin{aligned}&G(L(u)) =\\ &\langle\{\omega[\beta]/2\pi \mid \beta \in \pi_2(X,L(u)) \text{ is realized by a holomorphic disc}\}\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Definition 4.13. Let $G(X)$ be as in (3.3). We define $G_{\rm bulk}$ to be the discrete submonoid of $\mathbb{R}$ generated by $G(X)$ and the subset

$$\{\lambda - S_l \mid \lambda \in G(L(u)), \quad l = 1,\dots,K, \lambda > S_l\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

We remark that $G_{\rm bulk} \supset G(L(u))$.

Condition 4.14. We consider

$$\mathfrak b = \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} \mathfrak b_{l,r} D_{i(l,r)} \in \mathcal A^2(\Lambda_+(R)) \tag{4.18}$$

such that all $\mathfrak b_{l,r}$ are $G_{\rm bulk}$-gapped.

The main geometric input to the proof of the non-Fano case of Theorem 4.7 is the following.

Proposition 4.15. *We assume $\mathfrak b$ satisfies Condition 4.14 and consider*

$$\mathfrak b' = \mathfrak b + cT^{\lambda} D_{i(l,r)}, \tag{4.19}$$

with $c \in R$, $\lambda \in G_{\rm bulk}$, $l \le K$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak b'; y) &- \mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak b; y)\\ &= cT^{\lambda+\ell_{i(l,r)}(u)} y^{\vec v_{i(l,r)}} + \sum_{h=2}^{\infty} c_h T^{h\lambda+\ell_{i(l,r)}(u)} y^{\vec v_{i(l,r)}}\\ &\qquad\qquad + \sum_{h=1}^{\infty}\sum_{\sigma} c_{h,\sigma} T^{h\lambda+\ell'_\sigma(u)+\rho_\sigma} y^{\vec v_\sigma}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Here $c_h, c_{h,\sigma} \in R$, $\rho_\sigma \in G_{\rm bulk}$. Moreover there exists $e^i_\sigma \in \mathbb Z_{\ge 0}$ such that $\vec v_\sigma = \sum e^i_\sigma \vec v_i$, $\ell'_\sigma = \sum e^i_\sigma \ell_i$ and $\sum_i e^i_\sigma > 0$.

We prove Proposition 4.15 in section 7.

Definition 4.16. We enumerate elements of $G_{\rm bulk}$ so that

$$G_{\rm bulk} = \{\lambda^b_j \mid j = 0,1,2,\dots\}$$

where $0 = \lambda^b_0 < \lambda^b_1 < \lambda^b_2 < \cdots$.

(1) For $k \ge 1$, we define $\Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle_k$ to be a subspace of $\Lambda_0\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ consisting of elements of the form

$$\sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} T^{S_l+\lambda^b_j} P_{j,l}(y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{l,d(l)}, y_{l,d(l)}^{-1}) \tag{4.21}$$

where each $P_{j,l}$ is a Laurent polynomial of $y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{l,d(l)}$ with R coefficients, i.e.,

$$P_{j,l} \in R[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{l,d(l)}, y_{l,d(l)}^{-1}].$$

We put $\Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle_0 := \Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.

(2) We define $N_R^{G_{\rm bulk}}(k)$ to be the set of elements of the form

$$\sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l)}\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} c_{l,s,j} T^{S_l+\lambda^b_j} \mathbf e^*_{l,s}$$

from $N_R \otimes_R \Lambda_0$ with $c_{l,s,j} \in R$.

Lemma 4.17. *If $\mathfrak b$ satisfies Condition 4.14 then $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b} \in \Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.*

Proof. This will follow from Theorem 3.4. It is easy to see $\mathfrak{PO}_0^u \in \Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$ from the definitions of $\mathfrak{PO}_0^u$ and $G_{\rm bulk}$. So it suffices to show that the right hand side of (3.5) in Theorem 3.4 lies in $\Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$. We consider a term $c_\sigma y^{\vec v'_\sigma} T^{\ell'_\sigma(u)+\rho_\sigma}$ thereof. Let $\vec v'_\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^m e_\sigma^i \vec v_i$ as in (3.6). We put

$$l_0 = \sup\{l \mid \exists r\ e_\sigma^{i(l,r)} \ne 0\}.$$

Then

$$c_\sigma y^{\vec v'_\sigma} \in R[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{l_0,d(l_0)}, y_{l_0,d(l_0)}^{-1}].$$

On the other hand

$$\ell'_\sigma(u) = \sum e_\sigma^i \ell_i(u) \ge \ell_{i(l_0,r)}(u) = S_{l_0}$$

because $e_\sigma^i \ge 0$ and $\sum_i e_\sigma^i > 0$ and $e_\sigma^{i(l_0,r)} \ne 0$ for some r. Therefore

$$\ell'_\sigma(u) - S_{l_0} \in G_{\rm bulk}$$

and so $\ell'_\sigma(u) + \rho_\sigma = S_{l_0} + (\ell'_\sigma(u) - S_{l_0}) + \rho_\sigma \in G_{\rm bulk}$. This implies

$$c_\sigma y^{\vec v'_\sigma} T^{\ell'_\sigma(u)+\rho_\sigma} \in \Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle$$

as required. □

We now state the following lemma:

Lemma 4.18. *If $\mathfrak{P}$ lies in $\Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$, so does $\frac{\partial \mathfrak{P}}{\partial y_{l',s}}$ for the same k and so*

$$\sum_{l'=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l')} \mathfrak{c}_{l',s} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{P}}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{c}) \mathbf{e}^*_{l',s} \in N_R^{G_{\rm bulk}}(k) \tag{4.22}$$

for $\mathfrak{c} = (\mathfrak{c}_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{c}_{K,d(K)}) \in (R \setminus \{0\})^n$.

Proof. By the form (4.21) of the elements from $\Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle_k$, the first statement immediately follows. Then the last statement follows from the definition of $N_R^{G_{\rm bulk}}(k)$. □

Proposition 4.19. *There exists a sequence*

$$\mathfrak{b}(k) = \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} \mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k) D_{i(l,r)} \tag{4.23}$$

that satisfies Condition 4.14 and

$$\sum_{l'=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l')} \mathfrak{y}_{l',s} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}(k)}}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{y}) \mathbf{e}^*_{l',s} \in N_R^{G_{\rm bulk}}(k). \tag{4.24}$$

Moreover

$$\mathfrak{b}(k+1) - \mathfrak{b}(k) \equiv 0 \mod T^{\lambda_k^b}\Lambda_0. \tag{4.25}$$

Proof. We prove this by induction over k. The case $k = 0$ follows from Lemma 4.17. ($\mathfrak{b}(0) = 0$.)

Suppose we have found $\mathfrak{b}(k)$ as in the proposition. Then we have

$$\sum_{l'=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l')} \mathfrak{y}_{l',s} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}(k)}}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{y}) \mathbf{e}^*_{l',s} \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l)} c_{l,s,k} T^{S_l+\lambda_k^b} \mathbf{e}^*_{l,s} \mod N_R^{G_{\rm bulk}}(k+1)$$

for some $c_{l,s,k} \in R$.

Since $\{\vec{v}_{i(l',r)} \mid l' \le l\}$ spans $A_l^{\perp}$ for all $l \le K$ by definition, we can find $a_{l,r,k} \in R$ such that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{d(l)} c_{l,s,k}\mathbf{e}^*_{l,s} - \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} a_{l,r,k}\vec{v}_{i(l,r)} \in A_{l-1}^{\perp}.$$

Therefore by definition of $N_R^{G_{\text{bulk}}}(k)$ we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l)} c_{l,s,k}T^{S_l+\lambda_k^b}\mathbf{e}^*_{l,s} - \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} a_{l,r,k}T^{S_l+\lambda_k^b}\vec{v}_{i(l,r)} \in N_R^{G_{\text{bulk}}}(k+1).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l'=1}^{K}\sum_{s=1}^{d(l')} \mathfrak{y}_{l',s}\frac{\partial\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}(k)}}{\partial y_{l',s}}(\mathfrak{y})\mathbf{e}^*_{l',s}\\ &\equiv \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} a_{l,r,k}T^{S_l+\lambda_k^b}\vec{v}_{i(l,r)} \quad \text{mod } N_R^{G_{\text{bulk}}}(k+1)\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

We now put

$$\mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k+1) = \mathfrak{b}_{l,r}(k) - T^{\lambda_k^b}a_{l,r,k}(\mathfrak{y}^{\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}})^{-1}.$$

Lemma 4.20. *Let $\mathfrak{b}(k)$ be as in the induction hypothesis above. If $\lambda = \lambda_k^b$, then the second and the third terms of (4.20) are contained in $\Lambda_0^{G_{\text{bulk}}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle_{k+1}$.*

Proof. We first consider

$$c_h T^{h\lambda_k^b+\ell_{i(l,r)}(u)}y^{\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}} \tag{4.27}$$

which is in the second term of (4.20). ($h \ge 2$.) We remark that

$$c_h y^{\vec{v}_{i(l,r)}} \in R[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{l,d(l)}, y_{l,d(l)}^{-1}].$$

On the other hand,

$$h\lambda_k^b + \ell_{i(l,r)}(u) - S_l = h\lambda_k^b$$

is contained in G_{bulk} and so must be equal to $\lambda_{k'}^b$ for some $k' > k$ since $h \ge 2$. Therefore (4.27) is contained in $\Lambda_0^{G_{\text{bulk}}}\langle\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\rangle_{k+1}$, as required.

We next consider

$$c_{h,\sigma}T^{h\lambda_k^b+\ell'_\sigma(u)+\rho_\sigma}y^{\vec{v}_\sigma} \tag{4.28}$$

which is in the third term of (4.20). ($h \ge 1$.) We have $\vec{v}_\sigma = \sum e_\sigma^i\vec{v}_i$, $\ell'_\sigma = \sum e_\sigma^i\ell_i$. We put

$$l_0 = \sup\{l \mid \exists r\ e_\sigma^{i(l,r)} \ne 0\}.$$

Then

$$c_{h,\sigma}y^{\vec{v}_\sigma} \in R[y_{1,1}, y_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, y_{l_0,d(l_0)}, y_{l_0,d(l_0)}^{-1}].$$

On the other hand, since

$$\ell'_\sigma(u) = \sum_i e_\sigma^i\ell_i(u) \ge \ell_{i(l_0,r)}(u) = S_{l_0}$$

it follows that

$$\ell'_\sigma(u) + \rho_\sigma - S_{l_0} \in G_{\text{bulk}} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Therefore

$$h\lambda_k^b + \ell'_\sigma(u) + \rho_\sigma - S_{l_0} > \lambda_k^b$$

and so equal to $\lambda^b_{k'}$ for some $k' > k$. Hence (4.28) is contained in $\Lambda_0^{G_{\rm bulk}}\langle\!\langle y_{**}, y_{**}^{-1}\rangle\!\rangle_{k+1}$, as required.

The proof of Lemma 4.20 is complete. □

Then Proposition 4.15, (4.26), Lemma 4.18 and Lemma 4.20 imply that (4.24) is satisfied for $k+1$. The proof of Proposition 4.19 is complete. □

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 4.7. By (4.25)

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathfrak b(k) = \mathfrak b$$

converges. Then (4.24) implies

$$\mathfrak y_{l,s}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b}}{\partial y_{l,s}}(\mathfrak y) = 0,$$

as required. □

We next show that the proof of Theorem 4.7 also provides a way to calculate bulk $\mathfrak{PO}$-threshold $\overline{\mathfrak E}^{\rm bulk}(L(u))$ from the leading term equation.

Theorem 4.21. *The following two conditions for $\mathcal N$ are equivalent to each other.*

(1) *There exists $(\mathfrak b, b) \in \mathcal A(\Lambda_+)\times H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ such that*

$$HF((L(u_0),\mathfrak b,\mathfrak x),(L(u_0),\mathfrak b,\mathfrak x);\Lambda_0/T^{\mathcal N}) \cong H(T^n;\Lambda_0/T^{\mathcal N}). \tag{4.29}$$

(2) *We put $l_0 = \max\{l \mid S_l \le \mathcal N\}$. Then there exist $\mathfrak y_{l,j} \in R\setminus\{0\}$ for $l \le l_0$, $j = 1,\cdots,d(l)$ which solve the leading term equation (4.9) for $l \le l_0$.*

Corollary 4.22. *If the statement* (2) *of Theorem 4.21 holds then $\overline{\mathfrak E}^{\rm bulk}(L(u)) \ge 2\pi\mathcal N$.*

Proof of Theorem 4.21. The proof of (1) ⇒ (2) is similar to one in Theorem 4.7.

If (2) is satisfied, we can repeat the proof of Theorem 4.7 up to the order $\mathcal N$ to find $\mathfrak b$ such that (3.20) is satisfied. Then, (1) follows from Theorem 3.12. □

5. TWO POINTS BLOW UP OF $\mathbb CP^2$: AN EXAMPLE

Our main example is the two-points blow up X_2 of $\mathbb CP^2$. We take its Kähler form $\omega_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that the moment polytope is

$$P_{\alpha,\beta} = \{(u_1,u_2) \mid 0\le u_1\le 1, 0\le u_2\le 1-\alpha, \beta\le u_1+u_2\le 1\}. \tag{5.1}$$

Here

$$(\alpha,\beta)\in\Delta = \{(\alpha,\beta)\mid 0\le\alpha,\beta, \quad \alpha+\beta\le 1\}. \tag{5.2}$$

We remark that $\mathbb R_+\Delta$ is the Kähler cone of X_2.

In Example 10.17 [FOOO4] we studied this example in the case

$$\beta = \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \quad \frac13 < \alpha. \tag{5.3}$$

We continue the study this time involving bulk deformations.

We consider the point

$$\mathbf u = (u,\beta), \qquad u \in \left(\beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2}\right) = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1+\alpha}{4}\right) \tag{5.4}$$

and compute

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf u}(0;y_1,y_2) = T^\beta(y_2+y_2^{-1}) + T^u(y_1+y_1y_2) + T^{1-\beta-u}y_1^{-1}y_2^{-1}. \tag{5.5}$$

We note that (5.4) implies

$$\beta < u < 1 - \beta - u. \tag{5.6}$$

Therefore the leading term equation is

$$1 - y_2^{-2} = 0, \qquad 1 + y_2 = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Namely $(y_1, -1)$ is its solution for any y_1. Therefore Theorem 4.7 implies:

Proposition 5.1. *$L(\mathbf{u}) \subset (X_2, \omega_{\alpha,\beta})$ is bulk-balanced if (5.3) and (5.4) are satisfied.*

Theorem 1.1 for $k = 2$ will then follow from Proposition 3.15.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The case $k = 2$ (the two points blow up) is already proved. We consider $k = 3$. We blow up $(X_2, \omega_{\alpha,\beta})$ at the fixed point corresponding to $(1, 0) \in P_{\alpha,\beta}$. Then we have a toric Kähler structure on X_3 whose moment polytope is

$$\{(u_1, u_2) \in P_{\alpha,\beta} \mid u_1 \le 1 - \epsilon\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}}(y_1, y_2) = T^{\beta}(y_2 + y_2^{-1}) &+ T^{u}(y_1 + y_1 y_2) \\ &+ T^{1-\beta-u} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1} + T^{1-\epsilon-u} y_1^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

We remark that

$$1 - \beta - u < 1 - \epsilon - u$$

if ϵ is sufficiently small. Therefore the leading term equation at (5.4) is again (5.7). Therefore we can apply Theorem 4.7 to show that all $L(\mathbf{u})$ satisfying (5.4) are bulk-balanced. Thus Theorem 1.1 is proved for $k = 3$.

We can blow up again at the fixed point corresponding to $(1 - \epsilon, 0)$. We can then prove the case $k = 4$. (We remark that this time our toric manifold is not Fano. We never used the property X to be Fano in the above discussion.) We can continue arbitrary many times to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

Below we will examine the effect of bulk deformations more explicitly for the example of two points blow up. We consider the divisor

$$D_1 = \pi^{-1}(\{(u_1, u_2) \in P \mid u_2 = 0\})$$

and let

$$\mathfrak{b}_{w,\kappa} = w T^{\kappa} [D_1] \in \mathcal{A}^2(\Lambda_+). \tag{5.9}$$

$(w \in R \setminus \{0\})$. By Proposition 4.9, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{u}}(\mathfrak{b}_{w,\kappa}; y_1, y_2) =& T^{\beta}(\exp(\mathfrak{b}_{w,\kappa}) y_2 + y_2^{-1}) \\ &+ T^{u}(y_1 + y_1 y_2) + T^{1-\beta-u} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

We study the equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial y_1}(\mathfrak{b}_{w,\kappa}; y_1, y_2) = \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial y_2}(\mathfrak{b}_{w,\kappa}; y_1, y_2) = 0. \tag{5.11}$$

We put $y_2 = -1 + cT^{\mu}$, $y_1 = d$, with $c, d \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$. Taking the inequality (5.6) into account, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} cT^{\mu} + d^{-2} T^{1-\beta-2u} &\equiv 0 \mod T^{\max\{\mu, 1-\beta-2u\}} \\ -2cT^{\mu} + wT^{\kappa} + dT^{u-\beta} &\equiv 0 \mod T^{\max\{\mu, \kappa, u-\beta\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

In the following calculation we take $\overline{c}, \overline{d} \in R$ such that $c \equiv \overline{c}$, $d \equiv \overline{d} \mod \Lambda_+$.

(Case 1) $\mu = \kappa < u - \beta$.

We have $\overline{c} = w/2$, $\mu = 1 - \beta - 2u$. $\overline{d} = \pm\sqrt{-2/w}$. $u = (1-\beta)/2 - \kappa/2 = (1+\alpha)/4 - \kappa/2$. It implies $1/3 < u < (1+\alpha)/4$. The equation for $(\overline{c}, \overline{d})$ has 2 solutions. They are both simple. Hence in the same way as the proof of Theorem 10.4 [FOOO4] (the strongly non-degenerate case) we can show that these two solutions correspond to the solutions of (5.11).

(Case 2) $\mu = u - \beta < \kappa$.

We have $\overline{d} = 2\overline{c}$, $1 - \beta - 2u = \mu$. Hence $u = 1/3$. We can show that there are 3 solutions of (5.11) in the same way.

(Case 3) $\kappa = u - \beta < \mu$.

We have $\overline{d} = -w$. Then $\mu = 1 - \beta - 2u$. $\overline{c} = -w^{-2}$. Hence $u < 1/3$. We can show that there is 1 solution of (5.11) in the same way.

(Case 4) $\kappa = u - \beta = \mu$.

We have $-2\overline{c} + w + \overline{d} = 0$ and $1 - \beta - 2u = \mu$. Hence $u = 1/3$. $\kappa = \alpha/2 - 1/6$.

$$\overline{d}^2(\overline{d} + w) + 2 = 0. \tag{5.13}$$

This has three simple roots unless

$$\frac{4}{27}w^3 + 2 = 0. \tag{5.14}$$

When κ is small Case 1 and Case 3 occur. There are two fibers with nontrivial Floer cohomology (on (5.4)), that is $((\beta + \kappa, \beta)$ and $((1+\alpha)/4 - \kappa/2, \beta))$. They move from (β, β), $(1+\alpha)/4, \beta)$ to $(1/3, \beta)$. Then, when $\kappa = \alpha/2 - 1/6$, Case 4 occurs. If $\kappa > \alpha/2 - 1/6$ then Case 2 occurs and bulk deformation does not change the 'secondary' leading term equation (5.13).

It might be interesting to observe that it actually occurs that the 'secondary' leading term equation (5.13) has multiple roots. That is the case where (5.14) is satisfied. (We remark that the example where there is a multiple root for the leading term equation was found in [OsTy].)

6. OPERATOR $\mathfrak{q}$ IN THE TORIC CASE

In this section and the next, we study the moduli space of holomorphic discs and its effects on the operator $\mathfrak{q}$ and on the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; y_1, \dots, y_n)$.

Let $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ and $\beta \in H_2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z})$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta)$ the moduli space of stable maps from bordered Riemann surfaces of genus zero with $k+1$ boundary marked points and ℓ interior marked points, in homology class β. (See section 3 [FOOO1] = subsection 2.1.2 [FOOO3].) We require the boundary marked points to respect the cyclic order of $S^1 = \partial D^2$. (In other words, we consider the *main component* in the sense of section 3 [FOOO1].)) We assume $k \geq 0$. Then $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta)$ is compact. (See subsections 3.8.2 and 7.4.1 [FOOO3] = sections 13.2 and 32.1 [FOOO2], for the reason why we need to assume $k \geq 0$ for compactness.)

We denote an element of $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta)$ by

$$(\Sigma, \varphi, \{z_i^+ \mid 1 = 1, \dots, \ell\}, \{z_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, k\})$$

where Σ is a connected genus zero bordered semi-stable curve, $\varphi : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \to (X, L(u))$ is a holomorphic map and $z_i^+ \in \mathrm{Int}\Sigma$ and $z_i \in \partial\Sigma$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ be its subset consisting of all maps from a *smooth* disc. (Namely the stable map without disc or sphere bubble.)

We have the following proposition. Let $\beta_i \in H_2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z})$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$ be the classes with $\mu(\beta_i) = 2$ and

$$\beta_i \cap D_j = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j, \\ 0 & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

We recall from [CO] that the spin structure of $L(u)$ induced from the torus $T^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$ as its orbit is called the *standard* spin structure.

Proposition 6.1. (1) *If $\mu(\beta) < 0$, or $\mu(\beta) = 0$, $\beta \neq 0$, then $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ is empty.*

(2) *If $\mu(\beta) = 2$, $\beta \neq \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_m$, then $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ is empty.*

(3) *For $i = 1, \cdots, m$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{1;0}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta_i) &= \mathcal{M}_{1;0}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta_i), \\ \mathcal{M}_{1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta_i) &= \mathcal{M}_{1;0}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta_i) \times \overline{\mathrm{Conf}}(\ell; D^2). \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Here $\overline{\mathrm{Conf}}(\ell; D^2)$ is a compactification of the configuration space:

$$\{(z_1^+, \ldots, z_\ell^+) \mid z_i^+ \in \mathrm{Int}D^2, z_i^+ \neq z_j^+ \text{ for } i \neq j\} =: \mathrm{Conf}(\ell; D^2).$$

(See Remark 6.2.) Moreover $\mathcal{M}_{1;0}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta_i)$ is Fredholm regular. Furthermore the evaluation map

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_{1;0}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta_i) \to L(u)$$

is an orientation preserving diffeomorphism if we equip $L(u)$ with the standard spin structure.

(4) *For any β, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ is Fredholm regular. Moreover*

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_{1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta) \to L(u)$$

is a submersion.

(5) *If $\mathcal{M}_{1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta)$ is not empty then there exist $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha_j \in H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ such that*

$$\beta = \sum_i k_i \beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_j$$

and α_j is realized by a holomorphic sphere. There is at least one nonzero k_i.

Remark 6.2. We define the compactification of $\mathrm{Conf}(\ell; D^2)$ as follows. We consider $X = \mathbb{C}$, $L = S^1$. Let β_1 be the generator of $H_2(X; L)$ which is represented by a holomorphic disc. Then, clearly $\mathcal{M}_{0;\ell}^{\mathrm{reg}}(L; \beta_1)$ is identified with $\mathrm{Conf}(\ell; D^2)$. Hence $\mathcal{M}_{0;\ell}(L; \beta_1)$ is a compactification of it. We use this compactification for $\overline{\mathrm{Conf}}(\ell; D^2)$.

Proposition 6.1 follows easily from Theorem 11.1 [FOOO4] which in turn follows from [CO] as we explained in section 11 [FOOO4].

We next discuss Kuranishi structure of $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta)$. In sections 17,18 [FOOO1] or in section 7.1 [FOOO3] (=section 29 [FOOO2]), we equipped $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u), \beta)$

with a Kuranishi structure. In our toric case, this structure can be chosen to be T^n equivariant in the following sense: Let (V, E, Γ, ψ, s) be a Kuranishi chart (see section 5 [FO] and section A1 [FOOO3] = section A1 [FOOO2]). Here V is a smooth manifold with an action of a finite group Γ, $E \to V$ is a Γ equivariant vector bundle, s its Γ-equivariant section and $\psi : s^{-1}(0)/\Gamma \to \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta)$ is a homeomorphism onto an open set. Then we have a T^n action on V, E which commutes with Γ action, such that s is T^n equivariant. Moreover ψ is T^n equivariant. Here the T^n action is induced by one on X. (We recall that $L(u)$ is T^n invariant.) The construction of such Kuranishi structure is in Appendix 2 [FOOO4].

Let $\{D_a \mid a = 1, \cdots, B\}$ be the basis of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$. (Each D_a corresponds to a face of P.) We note that each of D_a is a T^n invariant submanifold. Let

$$ev_i^{\text{int}} : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta) \to X$$

be the evaluation map at the i-th interior marked point. ($i = 1, \dots, \ell$.) Namely

$$ev_i^{\text{int}}((\Sigma, \varphi, \{z_i^+\}, \{z_i\})) = \varphi(z_i^+).$$

We put $\underline{B} = \{1, \dots, B\}$ and denote the set of all maps $\mathbf{p} : \{1, \dots, \ell\} \to \underline{B}$ by $Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. We write $|\mathbf{p}| = \ell$ if $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$.

We define a fiber product

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta)_{(ev_1^{\text{int}},\dots,ev_\ell^{\text{int}})} \times_{X^\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} D_{\mathbf{p}(i)}. \tag{6.2}$$

Here the right hand side is the set of all $((\Sigma, \varphi, \{z_i^+\}, \{z_i\}), (p_1, \dots, p_\ell))$ such that $(\Sigma, \varphi, \{z_i^+\}, \{z_i\}) \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta)$, $p_i \in D_{\mathbf{p}(i)}$, and that $\varphi(z_i^+) = p_i$.

We define

$$ev_i : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta) \to L(u)$$

by

$$ev_i((\Sigma, \varphi, \{z_i^+\}, \{z_i\})) = \varphi(z_i).$$

It induces

$$ev_i : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p}) \to L(u)$$

in an obvious way.

Lemma 6.3. $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})$ *has a Kuranishi structure such that each Kuranishi chart is T^n-equivariant and the coordinate change preserves the T^n action. Moreover the evaluation map*

$$ev = (ev_0, ev_1, \dots, ev_k) : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p}) \to L(u)^{k+1}$$

is weakly submersive and T^n-equivariant. Our Kuranishi structure has a tangent bundle and is oriented.

Proof. The fiber product of Kuranishi structures is defined in section A1.2 [FOOO3] (= section A1.2 [FOOO2]). Since the maps we used here to define the fiber product are all T^n-equivariant it follows that the Kuranishi structure on the fiber product is T^n-equivariant. The orientability is proved in Chapter 8 [FOOO3] (= Chapter 9 [FOOO2]). The fact that ev is well defined and is weakly submersive is proved in section 7.1 [FOOO3] (=section 29 [FOOO2]) also. □

We next describe the boundary of our Kuranishi structure. For the description, we need to prepare some notations. We denote the set of shuffles of ℓ elements by

$$\mathrm{Shuff}(\ell) = \{(\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2) \mid \mathbb{L}_1 \cup \mathbb{L}_2 = \{1, \dots, \ell\},\ \mathbb{L}_1 \cap \mathbb{L}_2 = \emptyset\}. \tag{6.3}$$

We will define a map

$$\mathrm{Split} : \mathrm{Shuff}(\ell) \times Map(\ell, \underline{B}) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{\ell_1+\ell_2=\ell} Map(\ell_1, \underline{B}) \times Map(\ell_2, \underline{B}), \tag{6.4}$$

as follows: Let $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$ and $(\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2) \in \mathrm{Shuff}(\ell)$. We put $\ell_j = \#(\mathbb{L}_j)$ and let $\mathfrak{i}_j : \{1, \dots, \ell_j\} \cong \mathbb{L}_j$ be the order preserving bijection. We consider the map $\mathbf{p}_j : \{1, \dots, \ell_j\} \to \underline{B}$ defined by $\mathbf{p}_j(i) = \mathbf{p}(\mathfrak{i}_j(i))$, and set

$$\mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p}) := (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2).$$

We now define a gluing map, associated to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Glue}^{(\mathbb{L}_1,\mathbb{L}_2),\mathbf{p}}_{\ell_1,\ell_2;k_1,k_2;i;\beta_1,\beta_2} :&\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k_1+1;\ell_1}(L(u), \beta_1; \mathbf{p}_1)\,{}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_i} \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k_2+1;\ell_2}(L(u), \beta_2; \mathbf{p}_2)\\ &\to \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p})\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

below. Here $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$, $\ell = \ell_1 + \ell_2$, $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2$, and $i = 1, \dots, k_2$. Let

$$\mathbb{S}_j = ((\Sigma_{(j)}, \varphi_{(j)}, \{z^+_{i,(j)}\}, \{z_{i,(j)}\}) \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k_j+1;\ell_j}(L(u), \beta_j; \mathbf{p}_j)$$

$j = 1, 2$. We glue $z_{0,(1)} \in \partial\Sigma_1$ with $z_{i,(2)} \in \partial\Sigma_2$ to obtain

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \#_i \Sigma_2.$$

Suppose $(\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2)$ is an element of the fiber product in the left hand side of (6.5). Namely we assume

$$\varphi_{(1)}(z_{0,(1)}) = \varphi_{(2)}(z_{i,(2)}).$$

This defines a holomorphic map

$$\varphi = \varphi_{(1)} \#_i \varphi_{(2)} : \Sigma \to X$$

by putting $\varphi = \varphi_{(j)}$ on Σ_j.

Let $m \in \mathbb{L}_j$. Then $\mathfrak{i}_j(c) = m$, $\mathfrak{i}_j : \{1, \dots, \ell_j\} \cong \mathbb{L}_j$ be the order preserving bijection. We define the m-th interior marked point z^{int}_m of φ as $z^{\mathrm{int}}_{c;(j)} \in \Sigma_j \subset \Sigma$. We define the boundary marked points $(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ by

$$(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k) = (z_{0,(2)}, \dots, z_{i-1,(2)}, z_{1,(1)}, \dots, z_{k_1,(1)}, z_{i+1,(2)}, \dots, z_{k_2,(2)}).$$

Now we put

$$\mathbb{S} = ((\Sigma, \varphi, \{z^+_i\}, \{z_i\})$$

and

$$\mathrm{Glue}^{(\mathbb{L}_1,\mathbb{L}_2),\mathbf{p}}_{\ell_1,\ell_2;k_1,k_2;i;\beta_1,\beta_2}(\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2) = \mathbb{S}.$$

Lemma 6.4. *The boundary of* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p})$ *is isomorphic to the union of the images of* $\mathrm{Glue}^{(\mathbb{L}_1,\mathbb{L}_2),\mathbf{p}}_{\ell_1,\ell_2;k_1,k_2;i;\beta_1,\beta_2}$ *for* $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$, $\ell = \ell_1 + \ell_2$, $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2$, *and* $i = 1, \cdots, k_2$ *as a space with Kuranishi structure. The isomorphism preserves the* T^n *action.*

The isomorphism commutes with the evaluation maps at the boundary marked points.

The lemma directly follows from our construction of the Kuranishi structure we gave in section 7.1 [FOOO3] (= section 29 [FOOO2]).

Let $\mathfrak{S}_\ell$ be the symmetric group of ℓ elements. It acts on $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta)$ by changing the indices of interior marked points. It also acts on $Map(\ell,\underline{B})$ by $\sigma\cdot\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}\circ\sigma^{-1}$. Then for $\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_\ell$ we have

$$\sigma_* : \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p}) \to \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\sigma\cdot\mathbf{p}). \tag{6.6}$$

We next generalize Lemma 11.2 [FOOO4] to our situation. Let

$$\mathfrak{forget}_0 : \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p}) \to \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p}) \tag{6.7}$$

be the forgetful map which forgets all the boundary marked points except the 0-th one. We may choose our Kuranishi structures so that (6.7) is compatible with $\mathfrak{forget}_0$ in the same sense as Lemma 7.3.8 [FOOO3] (= Lemma 31.8 [FOOO2]).

Lemma 6.5. *For each given $E>0$, there exists a system of multisections $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}$ on $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})$ for $\beta\cap\omega < E$, $\mathbf{p}\in Map(\ell,\underline{B})$. They have the following properties:*

1. *They are transversal to* 0.
2. *They are invariant under the T^n action.*
3. *The multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}$ is the pull-back of the multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}$ by the forgetful map (6.7).*
4. *The restriction of $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}$ to the image of* $\mathrm{Glue}^{(\mathbb{L}_1,\mathbb{L}_2),\mathbf{p}}_{\ell_1,\ell_2;k_1,k_2;i;\beta_1,\beta_2}$ *is the fiber product of the multisections $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta_j,k_j+1,\ell_j,\mathbf{p}_j}$ $j=1,2$ with respect to the identification of the boundary given in Lemma 6.4.*
5. *For $\ell=0$ the multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,0,\emptyset}$ coincides with one defined in Lemma* 11.2 [FOOO4].
6. *The map (6.6) preserves our system of multisections.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 11.2 [FOOO4]. We define $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}$ for $\mathbf{p}\in Map(\ell,\underline{B})$ by an induction over $\omega\cap\beta$. The case $\ell=0$ is proved in Lemma 11.2 [FOOO4]. Condition (4) above determines the multisection on the boundary. T^n equivariance implies that $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}^{\rm main,reg}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}} \to L(u)$ is a submersion. Here

$$\mathcal{M}^{\rm main,reg}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}} = (\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}})^{-1}(0).$$

This fact and the induction hypothesis imply that the multisection we defined by (4) on the boundary of our moduli space is automatically transversal. (This is the important point that makes the proof of Lemma 6.5 easier than corresponding general discussion given in section 7.1 [FOOO3] (= section 30 [FOOO2]). See section 11 [FOOO4] for more discussion about this point.)

Thus we have defined a multisection on a neighborhood of the boundary. We can extend it to the interior so that it satisfies (1) and (2) in the following way: We first take the quotient $(V/T^n, E/T^n)$ of our Kuranishi chart. Since the T^n action is free on V the quotient space is a manifold on which Γ acts. Thus we can use the standard result of the theory of Kuranishi structure to define a transversal multisection on this chart where the multisection is already defined. We lift it to V and obtain a required multisection there. In this way we can construct the multisection inductively on the Kuranishi charts using the good coordinate system. (See Corollary 15.15 [FOOO4].)

To show (6) it suffices to take the quotient by the action of symmetric group and work out the induction on the quotient spaces. The proof of Lemma 6.5 is now complete. □

Corollary 6.6. *$\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}}$ is empty, if one of the following conditions are satisfied.*

1. $\mu(\beta)-\sum_i(2n-\dim D_{\mathbf{p}_i}-2)<0$.
2. $\mu(\beta)-\sum(2n-\dim D_{\mathbf{p}_i}-2)=0$ *and* $\beta\neq 0$.

Proof. We may assume $k=0$, by Lemma 6.5 (3).

We first consider the case of $\beta=0$. All the holomorphic curves in this homotopy class are constant maps. Then our moduli space is empty for $\ell>0$, since $L(u)\cap D=\emptyset$. This implies the lemma for the case $\beta=0$.

We next consider the case $\beta\neq 0$. The virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})$ (which is, by definition, its dimension as a space with Kuranishi structure) is

$$n+\mu(\beta)-\sum(2n-\dim D_{\mathbf{p}_i}-2)-2. \tag{6.8}$$

By the transversality (Lemma 6.5 (1)) and T^n equivariance (Lemma 6.5 (2)), we find that (6.8) is not smaller than $\dim L(u)=n$ if the perturbed moduli space is nonempty. (We use $\beta\neq 0$ here: If $\beta=0$ the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;0}(L(u),\beta_0)$ is $n-2$ but it is nonempty.) This finishes the proof of the lemma for the case $\beta\neq 0$. □

We now assume

$$\mu(\beta)-\sum(2n-\dim D_{\mathbf{p}_i}-2)=2, \tag{6.9}$$

and $\beta\neq 0$. Then

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}}$$

has a virtual fundamental *cycle*, by Corollary 6.6. We introduce the following invariant

Definition 6.7. We define $c(\beta;\mathbf{p})\in\mathbb{Q}$ by

$$c(\beta;\mathbf{p})[L(u)]=ev_{0*}([\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}}]).$$

Lemma 6.8. *The number $c(\beta;\mathbf{p})$ is independent of the choice of the system of multisections $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1}$ satisfying* (1) - (6) *of Proposition 6.5.*

The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 11.7 [FOOO4] and so is omitted.

Remark 6.9. (1) The independence of an open Gromov-Witten invariant such as $c(\beta;\mathbf{p})$ was proved in [KL] by taking equivariant perturbations in the situation where an appropriate S^1-action exists.

(2) Since $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u),\beta)$ is independent under the permutation of the interior marked points, it follows that $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u),\beta;\mathbf{p})$ is invariant under the permutation of the factors of $\mathbf{p}$. We take our multisection so that it is invariant under this permutation.

We use the above moduli spaces to define the operators $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;k,\ell}$ as follows.

Remark 6.10. Actually we need to fix E_0 and construct $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;k,\ell}$ for $\beta\cap\omega<E_0$. We then take inductive limit. This construction is explained in detail in sections 7.2 and 7.4 of [FOOO3] (= sections 30 and 32 [FOOO2]) so is omitted. For the application in this paper, we can use $A_{n,K}$ structure in place of A_∞ structure, so the process to take inductive limit is not necessary for applications.

Let $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. We put

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbf{p}) &= D_{\mathbf{p}(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes D_{\mathbf{p}(\ell)}, \\ SD(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\ell} D_{\mathbf{p}(\sigma(1))} \otimes \cdots \otimes D_{\mathbf{p}(\sigma(\ell))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $h_1, \dots, h_k$ be differential forms on $L(u)$. We put

$$\sum (\deg h_i - 1) - \mu(\beta) + \sum (2n - \dim D_{\mathbf{p}_i} - 2) + 2 = d$$

where we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg[\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}}] &= \operatorname{codim}[\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}}] \\ &= -\mu(\beta) + \sum (2n - \dim D_{\mathbf{p}_i} - 2) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

(See (6.8).) We then define a differential form of degree d on $L(u)$ by

$$\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}(D(\mathbf{p}); h_1, \dots, h_k) = \frac{1}{\ell!} (ev_0)_!(ev_1, \dots, ev_k)^*(h_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge h_k), \tag{6.10}$$

here ev_0, ev_i are the maps

$$(ev_0, \dots, ev_k) : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}} \longrightarrow L(u)^{k+1}$$

and $(ev_0)_!$ is the integration along the fiber. (Actually we need to put an appropriate sign. See the end of section 12 for sign.) More precisely we use the formula (6.10) for $(\beta, \ell, k) \neq (0,0,0), (0,0,1)$ and we put

$$\mathfrak{q}_{0;0,1}(h) = (-1)^{n + \deg h + 1} dh, \quad \mathfrak{q}_{0;0,2}(h_1, h_2) = (-1)^{\deg h_1 (\deg h_2 + 1)} h_1 \wedge h_2.$$

(6.10) defines a map $B_\ell(\mathcal{A}[2]) \otimes B_k(H(L(u); \mathbb{R})[1]) \to H(L(u); \mathbb{R})[1]$. We restrict it to $E_\ell(\mathcal{A}[2]) \otimes B_k(H(L(u); \mathbb{R})[1])$ and denote the restriction by the same symbol $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}$. Remark 6.9 (2) implies

$$\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}(SD(\mathbf{p}); h_1, \dots, h_k) = \mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}(D(\mathbf{p}); h_1, \dots, h_k)$$

We use T^n-equivariance to show that

$$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}} \to L(u)$$

is a proper submersion. Hence the integration along the fiber is well-defined and gives rise to smooth forms. (It is fairly obvious that the integration along the fiber on the zero set of a transversal multisection is well defined and that it satisfies Stokes' theorem. See section 16 [FOOO4] or section 12 of present paper.) Let $\Omega(L(u))$ be the de Rham complex of $L(u)$.

Definition 6.11. We put

$$\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\ell,k} = \sum_\beta T^{\omega \cap \beta / 2\pi} \mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}.$$

By restricting $\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\ell,k}$ to $E_\ell \mathcal{A} \subset B_\ell \mathcal{A}$ we obtain

$$\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k} : E_\ell(\mathcal{A}[2]) \otimes B_k(\Omega(L(u))[1]) \to \Omega(L(u))[1]$$

of degree $1 - \mu(\beta)$ and

$$\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\ell,k} : E_\ell(\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)(\mathbb{R})[2]) \otimes B_k((\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}))[1]) \to (\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}))[1].$$

Proposition 6.12. $\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}$ *satisfies (2.2).*

Proof. For $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$, $(\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2) \in \mathrm{Shuff}(\ell)$ we put

$$\mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p}) = (\mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p})_1, \mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p})_2)$$

It is easy to see that the coproduct $\Delta(SD(\mathbf{p}))$ is given by the formula

$$\Delta(SD(\mathbf{p})) = \sum_{(\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2) \in \mathrm{Shuff}(\ell)} \frac{\#|\mathbb{L}_1|!\#|\mathbb{L}_2|!}{\ell!} SD(\mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p})_1) \otimes SD(\mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p})_2).$$

Then (6.4) and (6.5) imply (2.2) in the same way as section 7.1 [FOOO3] (= section 13 [FOOO2]). □

Now for $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}^2(\Lambda_+)$, we define

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{dR,\mathfrak{b}}(h_1, \dots, h_k) = \mathfrak{q}^{dR}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; h_1, \dots, h_k) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\ell,k}(\mathfrak{b}^{\otimes \ell}; h_1, \dots, h_k). \tag{6.11}$$

Here

$$e^{\mathfrak{b}} = 1 + \mathfrak{b} + \mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{b} + \cdots .$$

Proposition 6.12 implies that $\mathfrak{m}_k^{dR,\mathfrak{b}}$ defines a structure of filtered A_∞ algebra on $\Omega(L(u))$.

Remark 6.13. We can prove that $(\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}), \{\mathfrak{m}_k^{dR,\mathfrak{b}}\}_{k=0}^\infty)$ is homotopy equivalent to the filtered A_∞ algebra defined by (2.6). The proof is a straight forward generalization of that of Lemma 37.55 [FOOO2] and is omitted here. We refer readers thereto for the details. In fact we do not need to use this equivalence for our applications in this paper. We can just use the de Rham version without involving the singular homology version.

We take a canonical model of $(\Omega(L(u))\widehat{\otimes}\Lambda_0(\mathbb{R})), \{\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}\}_{k=0}^\infty)$ to obtain a filtered A_∞ algebra $(H(L(u); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R})), \{\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},can}\}_{k=0}^\infty)$. Namely we define

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},can} : (H(L(u); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}))^{\otimes k} \to (H(L(u); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R})) \tag{6.12}$$

as follows. We fix a T^n-equivariant Riemannian metric on $L(u)$. Then a differential form is harmonic with respect to this metric if and only if it is T^n invariant. We identify $H^k(L(u); \mathbb{R})$ with the set of T^n-invariant k-forms.

Suppose $h_1, \cdots, h_k \in H(L(u); \mathbb{R})$ then $\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}(\mathbf{p}; h_1, \cdots, h_k)$ is T^n invariant and so is an element of $H(L(u); \mathbb{R})$. In fact all the moduli spaces and evaluation maps involved are T^n equivariant. Thus the restriction of $\mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}$ to the harmonic forms defines an operator

$$\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,k} : E_\ell(\mathcal{A}[2]) \otimes B_k(H(L(u); \mathbb{R})[1]) \to H(L(u); \mathbb{R})[1].$$

It induces

$$\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\ell,k} : E_\ell(\mathcal{A}[2]) \otimes B_k(H(L(u); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}))[1]) \to H(L(u); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}))[1].$$

in the same way as Definition 6.11. Proposition 6.12 holds for $\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\ell,k}$. Therefore by the same formula as (6.11) we define $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},can}$.

Lemma 6.14. *The filtered A_∞ algebra $(H(L(u); \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R})), \{\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},can}\}_{k=0}^\infty)$ is strict and unital homotopy equivalent to $(\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0(\mathbb{R}), \{\mathfrak{m}_k^{dR,\mathfrak{b}}\}_{k=0}^\infty)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{f}_1 : H(L(u);\Lambda_0(\mathbb{R})) \to \Omega(L(u))\,\widehat{\otimes}\,\Lambda_0(\mathbb{R})$ be the inclusion as harmonic forms. We set other $\mathfrak{f}_k$ to be 0. By definition they define filtered A_∞ homomorphism, which is strict and unital. (See Definitions 3.2.29, 3.3.11 [FOOO3] = Definitions 7.20, 8.17 [FOOO2].) It induces isomorphism on $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_1$ cohomology. The lemma now follows from Theorem 5.2.45 [FOOO3] (= Theorem 15.45 [FOOO2].) □

Remark 6.15. In the general situation the construction of the A_∞ operators of the canonical model and the homotopy equivalence in Lemma 6.14 is by summation over trees and is more involved. (See section 5.4 [FOOO3] = section 23 [FOOO2].) Here we take a short cut using the fact $L(u)$ is a torus and the T^n equivariance.

7. Calculation of potential function with bulk

We have defined a potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ in section 3. In this section we will partially calculate it and prove various results stated in that section whose proofs have been postponed until this section. The following is the key lemma for this purpose.

Lemma 7.1. *Let* $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+)$, $\beta \in H_2(X,L;\mathbb{Z})$, *and* $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell,\underline{B})$. *We assume* (*6.9*). *Then we have*

$$\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,k}(D(\mathbf{p});\mathfrak{x},\dots,\mathfrak{x}) = \frac{c(\beta;\mathbf{p})}{\ell!k!}(\partial\beta\cap\mathfrak{x})^k\cdot PD([L(u)]).$$

where $PD([L(u)])$ *is the Poincaré dual to the fundamental class* $[L(u)] \in H_n(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 11.8 [FOOO4] and proceed as follows.

Let h be a harmonic representative of the class $\mathfrak{x}$. We have:

$$\int_{L(u)} \mathfrak{q}^{dR}_{\beta;\ell,k}(D(\mathbf{p});h,\dots,h) = \frac{c(\beta;\mathbf{p})}{\ell!k!}(\partial\beta\cap\mathfrak{x})^k. \tag{7.1}$$

The proof is the same as that of Formula (10.10) [FOOO4], using Definition 6.7. The lemma follows immediately. □

Proof of Proposition 3.1. This is an immediate consequence of Corollary 6.6 and Lemma 7.1. In fact it implies that $\mathfrak{m}^{can,\mathfrak{b}}_k(b,\dots,b)$ can be only degree 0, that is proportional to $PD[L(u)]$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Let $\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{a=1}^B \mathfrak{b}_a D_a$, $\mathfrak{b}_a \in \Lambda_+$. We assume $\mathfrak{b}_a$ is $G_{\rm bulk}$-gapped. We have

$$e^{\mathfrak{b}} = \sum_\ell \sum_{\mathbf{p}\in Map(\ell,\underline{B})} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} D(\mathbf{p}).$$

Here

$$\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} = \prod_j \mathfrak{b}_{\mathbf{p}(j)}.$$

We have:

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};b) = \sum_{\beta,\mathbf{p},k} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;|\mathbf{p}|,k}(D(\mathbf{p});b,\dots,b).$$

By the degree counting the sum is nonzero only when (6.9) is satisfied. Therefore by Lemma 7.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};b) &= \sum_{\beta,\mathbf{p},k} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}\frac{c(\beta;\mathbf{p})}{k!|\mathbf{p}|!}(b\cap\partial\beta)^k \\ &= \sum_{\beta,\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|!}\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi} c(\beta;\mathbf{p})\exp(b\cap\partial\beta).\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

The sum of the cases $\beta = \beta_i$ $(i = 1,\dots,m)$ and $|\mathbf{p}| = 0$ is $\mathfrak{PO}^u_0(b)$.

We next study other terms for $|\mathbf{p}| \ne 0$. We first consider the case $\beta = \beta_i$, $\ell \ne 0$. Then the corresponding term is a sum of the terms written as

$$cT^{\ell_i(u)+\rho} y^{\vec v_i}. \tag{7.3}$$

Here $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and ρ is a sum of the numbers which appears as an exponents of $\mathfrak{b}_a$ for various a. It is nonzero since $\ell \ne 0$ and $\mathfrak{b}_a \in \Lambda_+$. Therefore $\rho \in G_{\rm bulk} \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore (7.3) is of the form appearing in the right hand side of (3.5).

We next consider the case $\beta \ne \beta_i$ $(i = 1,\dots,m)$. We assume $c(\beta;\mathbf{p}) \ne 0$ in addition. Then by Proposition 6.1 (5) we have e^i and ρ such that

$$\frac{\beta\cap\omega}{2\pi} = \sum_i e^i \ell_i(u) + \rho.$$

Here $e^i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ and $\sum e^i > 0$ and ρ is a sum of symplectic areas of holomorphic spheres divided by 2π. Thus the corresponding term is a sum of the terms

$$cT^{\sum_i e^i\ell_i(u)+\rho+\rho'} y^{\sum e^i \vec v_i}.$$

Here $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and ρ' is a sum of the numbers that appear as the exponents of $\mathfrak{b}_a$ for various a. This is exactly of the form in the right hand side of (3.5).

Finally we prove (3.7). We first fix β. There can be infinitely many terms contributing to $\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,k}$. Namely it is possible that $\ell \to \infty$. The exponent of any such term is not smaller than

$$\frac{\beta\cap\omega}{2\pi} + \ell\rho_0 \tag{7.4}$$

where

$$\rho_0 = \inf(G_{\rm bulk} \setminus \{0\}).$$

(7.4) goes to infinity as $\ell \to \infty$.

We next consider the case where infinitely many different β's contribute to $\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,k}$. We denote the β's by β_γ. Suppose $\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta_\gamma;\ell_\gamma,k_\gamma}$ is nonzero. The term corresponding thereto in (3.5) is of the form:

$$c_\gamma T^{\ell'_\gamma(u)+\rho_\gamma} y_1^{v'_{\gamma,1}} \cdots y_n^{v'_{\gamma,n}} \tag{7.5}$$

such that $d\ell'_\gamma = (v'_{\gamma,1},\dots,v'_{\gamma,n})$. We study $\ell'_\gamma(u)$ and ρ_γ and prove that ρ_γ goes to infinity.

We apply Proposition 6.1 (5) and obtain

$$\beta_\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^m k_{i,\gamma}\beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_{\gamma,j}$$

with $k_{i,\gamma} \ge 0$. We have

$$\ell'_\gamma(u) = \sum_{i=1}^m k_{i,\gamma}\ell_i(u)$$

and

$$\rho_\gamma = \sum_j \frac{\alpha_{\gamma,j} \cap [\omega]}{2\pi} + (\text{a sum of exponents appearing in } \mathfrak{b}).$$

If $(k_{1,\gamma}, \dots, k_{n,\gamma}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is bounded as $\gamma \to \infty$, then $\sum_j \alpha_{\gamma,j} \in H_2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ is necessarily unbounded. Therefore

$$\rho_\gamma \geq \sum_j \frac{\alpha_{\gamma,j} \cap [\omega]}{2\pi}$$

goes to infinity, as required.

We next assume that $(k_{1,\gamma}, \dots, k_{n,\gamma}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is unbounded. Then the sum of its Maslov indices

$$\sum_{i=1}^n k_{i,\gamma}\mu(\beta_i) = 2\sum_{i=1}^n k_{i,\gamma}$$

is unbounded. (We recall $k_{i,\gamma} \geq 0$.) Therefore thanks to the formula

$$\mu(\beta_\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^m k_{i,\gamma}\mu(\beta_i) + 2\sum_j c_1(X) \cap \alpha_{\gamma,j},$$

one of the following alternatives (not-necessarily exclusive to each other) must occur:

(a) $|\sum_j c_1(X) \cap \alpha_{\gamma,j}|$ is unbounded.
(b) $\mu(\beta_\gamma)$ is unbounded.

For the case (a), $\sum_j \alpha_{\gamma,j} \in H_2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ is unbounded. Therefore

$$\rho_\gamma \geq \sum_j \frac{\alpha_{\gamma,j} \cap [\omega]}{2\pi}$$

goes to infinity similarly as before.

For the case (b), we recall the general dimension formula

$$\dim \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell_\gamma}(L(u);\beta_\gamma) = 2\ell_\gamma + n + \mu(\beta_\gamma) - 2.$$

On the other hand, we must have

$$\dim \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;\ell_\gamma}(L(u);\beta_\gamma : \mathbf{p}) = n,$$

since $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta_\gamma;\ell_\gamma,k_\gamma}(\mathbf{p};b)$ is nonzero. Therefore we should have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell_\gamma}(\deg \mathbf{p}_j - 2) = \mu(\beta_\gamma) - 2.$$

This goes to infinity and so does ℓ_γ as $\gamma \to \infty$. Since we have

$$\rho_\gamma \geq \ell_\gamma \rho_0,$$

ρ_γ goes to infinity, as required. The proof of Theorem 3.4 is now complete. □

Proof of Proposition 4.9. We assume that $\mathfrak{b}$ is as in (4.10). We remark that $D_{i(l,r)} \in H^2(D;\mathbb{Z})$. Therefore a dimension counting argument shows that only β with $\mu(\beta) = 2$ contributes to $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};b)$. Then by the assumption that X is Fano we derive that only β_i's for $(i = 1, \dots, m)$ contribute among those β's.

Thus we have obtained

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};b) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|!}\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} T^{\ell_i(u)} c(\beta_i;\mathbf{p}) y^{\vec v_i}. \tag{7.6}$$

We next calculate $c(\beta_i;\mathbf{p})$. By definition we have

$$c(\beta_i;\mathbf{p})[L(u)] = ev_{0*}(\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;|\mathbf{p}|}(L(u),\beta_i;\mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1,\ell,\mathbf{p}}})$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;|\mathbf{p}|}(L(u),\beta_i;\mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;|\mathbf{p}|}(L(u),\beta_i) \times_{X^{|\mathbf{p}|}} \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{p}|} D_{\mathbf{p}(j)}.$$

We consider

$$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}_{1;0}(L(u),\beta_i) \to L(u).$$

It is a diffeomorphism by Proposition 6.1. We fix $p_0 \in L(u)$ and let $ev_0^{-1}(p_0) = \{\varphi\}$. Since $[\varphi] = \beta_i$ it follows that

$$[\varphi] \cap D(\mathbf{p}(j)) = \begin{cases} 1 & j = i, \\ 0 & j \neq i. \end{cases}$$

We remark that the number $c(\beta_i;\mathbf{p})$ is well defined, that is, independent of the perturbation. So we can perform the calculation in the homology level to find that

$$c(\beta_i;\mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbf{p}(j) = i \text{ for all } j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.7}$$

Thus (7.6) is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(\mathfrak{b}_i) T^{\ell_i(u)} y^{\vec v_i}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{b}_i = 0$ by definition for $i \geq \mathcal{K}+1$ in the decomposition of $\mathfrak{b}$ in (4.10), this sum can be rewritten as (4.11) which finishes the proof of Proposition 4.9. □

Proof of Proposition 4.15. We assume that $\mathfrak{b}$ satisfies Condition 4.14. Again by dimension counting only β with $\mu(\beta) = 2$ contributes to $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};b)$. In Proposition 4.15 we do not assume that X is Fano. So the homology classes β other than β_i $(i = 1,\cdots,m)$ may contribute.

We first study the contribution of β_i's. We put

$$\mathfrak{P}_0(\mathfrak{b};b) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|!}\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} T^{\ell_i(u)} c(\beta_i;\mathbf{p}) y^{\vec v_i}.$$

Substituting (7.7) into $\mathfrak{P}_0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{P}_0(\mathfrak{b}';b) - \mathfrak{P}_0(\mathfrak{b};b) &= \sum_{i=1}^m (\exp(\mathfrak{b}'_i) - \exp(\mathfrak{b}_i)) T^{\ell_i(u)} y^{\vec v_i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m (\exp(\mathfrak{b}_{i(l,r)} + cT^{\lambda}) - \exp(\mathfrak{b}_{i(l,r)})) T^{S_l} y^{\vec v_{i(l,r)}}.\end{aligned}$$

This is in the form of the sum of the first 2 terms of the right hand side of (4.20).

We next study the contribution of $\beta \ne \beta_i$. We have only to consider β's satisfying that $\mu(\beta) = 2$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\text{main}}(L(u);\beta) \ne \emptyset$. We put

$$\mathfrak{P}_\beta(\mathfrak{b};b) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|!} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi} c(\beta;\mathbf{p}) \exp(b \cap \partial\beta).$$

If we write

$$\beta = \sum_{i=1}^m e^i_\beta \beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_{\beta,j}$$

as in Proposition 6.1 (5), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \cap [\omega] &= \sum_{i=1}^m e^i_\beta \ell_i(u) + \sum_j \alpha_{\beta,j} \cap [\omega] \\ \exp(b \cap \partial\beta) &= y^{\sum_{i=1}^m e^i_\beta \vec v_i}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $e^i_\beta \ge 0$ and $\sum_i e^i_\beta > 0$. Moreover, since $\beta \ne \beta_i$ $(i = 1, \dots, m)$ it follows that $\sum_j \alpha_{\beta,j} \ne 0$. (We use $\mu(\beta) = 2$ to prove this.) Therefore

$$\rho_\beta = \sum_j \alpha_{\beta,j} \cap [\omega]/2\pi > 0.$$

Hence

$$\mathfrak{P}_\beta(\mathfrak{b}';b) - \mathfrak{P}_\beta(\mathfrak{b};b) = \sum_\sigma \sum_{h=1}^\infty c_{\sigma,h} T^{\sum_i e^i_\beta \ell_i(u) + \rho_\beta + h\lambda + \rho'_\sigma} y^{\sum_i e^i_\beta \vec v_i},$$

where $c_{\sigma,h} \in R$ and ρ'_σ is a sum of exponents of T in $\mathfrak{b}$. This corresponds to the third term of (4.20). In fact $\ell'_\sigma = \sum_i e^i_\beta \ell_i$, $\rho_\sigma = \rho'_\sigma + \rho_\beta$ therein.

Now Proposition 4.15 follows if we rewrite

$$\mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{b}';b) - \mathfrak{PO}(\mathfrak{b};b) = (\mathfrak{P}_0(\mathfrak{b}';b) - \mathfrak{P}_0(\mathfrak{b};b)) + \sum_\beta (\mathfrak{P}_\beta(\mathfrak{b}';b) - \mathfrak{P}_\beta(\mathfrak{b};b)).$$

□

8. Floer cohomology and non-displacement of Lagrangian submanifolds

In this section we discuss how we apply Floer cohomology and the potential function to the study of non-displacement property of Lagrangian submanifolds. Especially we will prove Proposition 3.15 and Theorem 3.19. The argument of this section is a minor modification and combination of the one given in [FOOO4] except that we integrate *bulk deformations* into the argument therein. (The way to use bulk deformation in the study of non-displacement of Lagrangian submanifold is described in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13 [FOOO2].)) This generalization is quite straightforward. We however gives details in order to make this paper as self-contained as possible for readers' convenience. To avoid too much repetition of the materials from [FOOO3], we will use the de Rham cohomology version instead of the singular cohomology version of filtered A_∞ algebra associated to a Lagrangian submanifolds in this section. The de Rham version is suitable for the purpose of present paper since we can easily realize *exact* unit in de Rham theory. We are using weak bounding cochain which is easier to handle in case exact unit (rather than homotopy unit) exists.

In this section we put $R = \mathbb{C}$. We write Λ_0, Λ_+, Λ in place of $\Lambda_0(\mathbb{C})$, $\Lambda_+(\mathbb{C})$, $\Lambda(\mathbb{C})$ respectively, in this section.

We first explain how we enlarge the deformation parameters $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x})$ of Floer cohomology to

$$\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+) \times H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0) \supset \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+) \times H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+),$$

by including $b \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0) \supset H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+)$ as in [FOOO4] where we borrowed the idea of Cho [Cho] of considering Floer cohomology twisted with flat *non-unitary* line bundles in the study of displacement problem of Lagrangian submanifolds.

Definition 8.1. Let

$$\mathfrak{x} = \sum_i \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i \in H^1(L(u_0); \Lambda_0) \tag{8.1}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{x}_i = \mathfrak{x}_{i,0} + \mathfrak{x}_{i,+} \tag{8.2}$$

where $\mathfrak{x}_{i,0} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{x}_{i,+} \in \Lambda_+$. We put

$$\mathfrak{y}_{i,0} = \exp(\mathfrak{x}_{i,0}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{x}_{i,0}^n}{n!} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Let $\rho : H_1(L(u); \mathbb{Z}) \to \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ be the representation defined by $\rho(\mathbf{e}_i) = \mathfrak{y}_{i,0}$.

Definition 8.2. We define

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k}^{can,\rho} : E_\ell \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)[2] \otimes B_k(H(L(u); \Lambda_0)[1] \to H(L(u); \Lambda_0)[1]$$

by

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k}^{can,\rho} = \sum_\beta \mathfrak{y}_{1,0}^{\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_1^*} \cdots \mathfrak{y}_{n,0}^{\partial\beta \cap \mathbf{e}_n^*} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi} \mathfrak{q}_{\beta;\ell,k}^{can}. \tag{8.3}$$

We then define:

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},can,\mathfrak{x}}(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \sum_\ell \mathfrak{q}_\ell^{can,\rho}(\mathfrak{b}^\ell; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} x_1 e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \cdots e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} x_k e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}), \tag{8.4}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{PO}_\rho^u(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}_+) = \sum_{\ell,k} \mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k}^{can,\rho}(\mathfrak{b}^\ell; \mathfrak{x}_+^k). \tag{8.5}$$

We also define

$$\mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k}^\rho : E_\ell(\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)[2]) \otimes B_k((\Omega(L(u) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \to (\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1].$$

and $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}$ in the same way.

Lemma 8.3. (1) *$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}$, $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},can,\mathfrak{x}}$ define the structures of filtered A_∞ algebras on $\Omega(L(u))\widehat{\otimes}\Lambda_0$ and on $H(L(u); \Lambda_0)$, respectively.*

(2) *Let $\mathfrak{PO}^u : H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0) \to \Lambda_0$ be the extended potential function as in Lemma 3.5. Then we have*

$$\mathfrak{PO}_\rho^u(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{x}_+) = \mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{x})$$

if (8.2) holds.

Proof. The proof of (1) is the same as that of Proposition 12.2 [FOOO4]. The proof of (2) is the same as the proof of Lemma 4.9 [FOOO4]. □

Definition 8.4.

$$HF((L(u),\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0) := \frac{\text{Ker } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},can,\mathfrak{x}}}{\text{Im } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},can,\mathfrak{x}}}.$$

In the same way as Lemma 6.14 we can prove

$$\frac{\text{Ker } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},can,\mathfrak{x}}}{\text{Im } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},can,\mathfrak{x}}} \cong \frac{\text{Ker } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}}{\text{Im } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}}. \tag{8.6}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.12. Based on the above definition the proof goes in the same way as the proof of Theorem 4.10 [FOOO4]. □

We next prove Proposition 3.15 and Theorem 3.19. Again the proofs will be similar to the proofs of Proposition 4.12 and Theorem 5.11 [FOOO4] in which we use a variant of Theorem 2.5 that also employs Floer cohomology twisted by non-unitary flat bundles (whose holonomy is ρ as above).

Now we provide the details of the above mentioned proofs.

Let $\psi_t : X \to X$ be a Hamiltonian isotopy with $\psi_0 =$ identity. We put $\psi_1 = \psi$. We consider the pair

$$L^{(0)} = L(u), \quad L^{(1)} = \psi(L(u))$$

such that $L^{(1)}$ is transversal to $L^{(0)}$. By perturbing ψ_t a bit, we may assume the following:

Condition 8.5. If $p \in L(u) \cap \psi(L(u))$ then

$$\psi_t(p) \notin \pi^{-1}(\partial P) \tag{8.7}$$

for any $t \in [0,1]$.

We put $\psi_t^* J = J_t$ where J is the standard complex structure of X. Then $J_0 = J$ and $J_1 = \psi_*(J)$.

Let $p, q \in L^{(0)} \cap L^{(1)}$. We consider the homotopy class of maps

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \to X \tag{8.8}$$

such that

1. $\lim_{\tau\to-\infty} \varphi(\tau,t) = p$, $\lim_{\tau\to+\infty} \varphi(\tau,t) = q$.
2. $\varphi(\tau,0) \in L^{(0)}$, $\varphi(\tau,1) \in L^{(1)}$.

We denote by $\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q)$ the set of all such homotopy classes. We then define maps

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,r) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};r,q) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q),\\
&\pi_2(X;L^{(1)}) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q),\\
&\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q) \times \pi_2(X;L^{(0)}) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q),
\end{aligned} \tag{8.9}$$

as follows. The map in the first line is an obvious concatenation. To define the map in the second line we first fix a base point $p_0 \in L^{(1)}$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \to X$ represent an element of $\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q)$ and $\phi : D^2 \to X$ an element of $\pi_2(X;L^{(1)})$, respectively. ($\phi(1) = p_0$ and $\phi(\partial D^2) \subset L^{(1)}$.) We take a path γ joining p_0 and $\varphi(0,1)$ in $L^{(1)}$. We take the boundary connected sum $(\mathbb{R} \times [0,1])\#D^2$ of $\mathbb{R} \times [0,1]$ and D^2 along $(0,1)$ and 1, which is nothing but $\mathbb{R} \times [0,1]$. We use γ to obtain the map $\varphi\#_\gamma\phi : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \cong (\mathbb{R} \times [0,1])\#D^2 \to X$ joining φ and ϕ. The homotopy class of $\varphi\#_\gamma\phi$ is independent of γ since $\pi_1(L^{(1)})$ acts trivially on $\pi_2(X;L^{(1)})$. (We use the fact that $L^{(1)}$ is a torus here.) We thus defined the map in the second line. The map in the third line is defined in the same way.

We denote the maps in (8.9) by #.

Remark 8.6.
1. We here use the set $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ of *homotopy* classes. In the last two sections we use homology group $H_2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z})$. In fact $H_2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z}) \cong \pi_2(X, L(u))$ in our situation and so we can instead use the latter.
2. The definition of # above is rather ad hoc since we use the fact that $L^{(1)}$ is a torus. In the general case we use the set of Γ equivalence classes of the elements of $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ in place of $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ itself. (See Definition-Proposition 2.3.9 [FOOO3] = Definition-Proposition 4.9 [FOOO2].)

Definition 8.7. We consider the moduli space of maps (8.8) satisfying (1), (2) above, in homotopy class $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$, and satisfying the equation:

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau} + J_t \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \right) = 0. \tag{8.10}$$

We denote it by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathrm{reg}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B).$$

We put k_1 marked points $(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)$ on $\{(\tau, 1) \mid \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$, k_0 marked points $(\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)$ on $\{(\tau, 0) \mid \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$, and ℓ marked points (τ_i, t_i) on $\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)$. We number the $k_1 + k_0$ marked points so that it respects to the counter-clockwise cyclic order. The totality of such $(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\})$ is denoted by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{k_1, k_0; \ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B).$$

We divide this space by the $\mathbb{R}$ action induced by the translation of τ direction to obtain $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{reg}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$, and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{k_1, k_0; \ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$. Finally we compactify them to obtain $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$, and $\mathcal{M}_{k_1, k_0; \ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$.

See Definition 3.7.24 [FOOO3] (= Definition 12.24 [FOOO2]) (the case $\ell = 0$) and subsection 3.8.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13.8 [FOOO2]) for the detail.

Remark 8.8. In [FOOO3] we defined $\mathcal{M}_{k_1, k_0}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; [\ell_p, w_1], [\ell_q, w_2])$. The choice of $[w_1]$ and B uniquely determines $[w_2]$ by the relation $[w_1] \# B = [w_2]$, but there could be more than one element $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ satisfying $[w_1] \# B = [w_2]$. This is because the equivalence class $[\ell_p, w]$ is not the homotopy class but the equivalence class of a weaker relation. But the number of such classes B for which $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B) \neq \emptyset$ is finite by Gromov's compactness. Therefore $\mathcal{M}_{k_1, k_0}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; [\ell_p, w_1], [\ell_q, w_2])$ is a finite union of $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ with B satisfying $[w_1] \# B = [w_2]$.

We define the evaluation map

$$ev = (ev^{\mathrm{int}}, ev^{(1)}, ev^{(0)}) : \mathcal{M}_{k_1, k_0; \ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B) \to X^{\ell} \times (L(u))^{k_1} \times (L(u))^{k_0},$$

as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&ev_i^{(0)}(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\}) = \varphi((\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)), \\
&ev_i^{(1)}(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\}) = \psi^{-1}(\varphi((\tau_i^{(1)}, 1))), \\
&ev_i^{\mathrm{int}}(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\}) = \psi_{t_i}^{-1}(\varphi((\tau_i, t_i))).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.11}$$

We have diffeomorphisms $L(u) \cong L^{(0)}$ and $L(u) \cong L^{(1)}$. (The former is the identity and the latter is ψ.)

Lemma 8.9. *$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ has an oriented Kuranishi structure with corners. Its boundary is isomorphic to the union of the follows three kinds of fiber products as spaces with Kuranishi structure.*

(1)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, r; B') \times \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; r, q; B'')$$
where $k_j' + k_j'' = k_j$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $B' \# B'' = B$. The product is the direct product.

(2)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+1;\ell'}(L(u); \beta')\ {}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_i^{(1)}}\ \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0;\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B'').$$
Here $\beta' \in \pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \cong \pi_2(X; L(u))$, $k_1' + k_1'' = k_1 + 1$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $\beta' \# B'' = B$. The fiber product is taken over $L^{(1)} \cong L(u)$ by using $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{\ell';k_1'+1}(L(u); \beta') \to L(u)$ and $ev_i^{(1)} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0;\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B'') \to L^{(1)}$. Here $i = 1, \dots, k_1''$.

(3)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B')\ {}_{ev_i^{(0)}}\times_{ev_0}\ \mathcal{M}_{k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u); \beta'').$$
Here $\beta'' \in \pi_2(X; L^{(0)}) \cong \pi_2(X; L(u))$, $k_0' + k_0'' = k_0 + 1$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $B' \# \beta'' = B$. The fiber product is taken over $L^{(0)} \cong L(u)$ by using $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u); \beta'') \to L(u)$ and $ev_i^{(0)} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B') \to L^{(0)}$.

Lemma 8.9 is proved in the same way as subsection 7.1.4 [FOOO3] (= section 29.4 [FOOO2]).

Definition 8.10. We next take $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$ and define
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B; \mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)\ {}_{ev^+}\times \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} D_{\mathbf{p}(i)}. \tag{8.12}$$
It is a space with oriented Kuranishi structure with corners.

We remark that Condition 8.5 implies that if $p = q$, $B = B_0 = 0$ then the set $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, p; B_0)$ is empty.

Lemma 8.11. *The boundary of $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B; \mathbf{p})$ is a union of the following three types of fiber product as a space with Kuranishi structure.*

(1)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, r; B'; \mathbf{p}_1) \times \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; r, q; B''; \mathbf{p}_2).$$
Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (1) *and*
$$(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) = \mathrm{Split}((\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2), \mathbf{p}) \tag{8.13}$$
for some $(\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2) \in \mathrm{Shuff}(\ell)$.

(2)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+1;\ell'}(L(u); \beta'; \mathbf{p}_1)\ {}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_i^{(1)}}\ \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0;\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B''; \mathbf{p}_2).$$
Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (2) *and (8.13).*

(3)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q;B';\mathbf{p}_1)\ {}_{ev_i^{(0)}}\times_{ev_0}\ \mathcal{M}_{k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u);\beta'';\mathbf{p}_2).$$

Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (3) *and* (*8.13*).

The proof is immediate from Lemma 8.9. We remark that by our definition of evaluation map $ev_i^{\rm int}$ the homology class β', β'' in (2), (3) above are nonzero.

We now construct a virtual fundamental chains on the moduli space (8.12). We remark that we already defined a system of multisections on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(L(u);\beta;\mathbf{p})$ in Lemma 6.5.

Lemma 8.12. *For any E_0, there exists a system of multisections* (*8.12*) *of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q;B;\mathbf{p})$ with $B\cap\omega<E_0$, which are compatible to one another and to the multisections provided in Lemma 6.5 under the identification of the boundaries given in Lemma 8.11.*

Proof. We construct multisections on the moduli space (8.12) by induction over $\int_\beta\omega$.

We remark that the boundary condition for (8.10) is not T^n equivariant anymore: while the boundary $L^{(0)}=L(u)$ is T^n invariant, $L^{(1)}=\psi(L(u))$ is not. So there is no way to define a T^n-action on our moduli space (8.12).

We however remark that ev_0 in (2) and (3) of Lemma 8.11 is a submersion after perturbation. This is a consequence of (2) of Lemma 6.5. Moreover the fiber product in (1) of Lemma 8.11 is actually a direct product. Therefore the perturbation near the boundary at each step of the induction is automatically transversal by the induction hypothesis. Therefore we can extend the perturbation by the standard theory of Kuranishi structure and multisection. This implies Lemma 8.12. □

We are now ready to define Floer cohomology with bulk deformation denoted by

$$HF((L^{(1)},\mathfrak{b},\psi_*(\mathfrak{x})),(L^{(0)},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0).$$

Let us use the notation of Definition 8.1. We have a representation $\rho:\pi_1(L(u))\to\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$. We choose a flat $\mathbb{C}$-bundle $(\mathcal{L},\nabla)$ whose holonomy representation is ρ. It determines flat $\mathbb{C}$ bundles on $L^{(0)}$, $L^{(1)}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{L}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}$, respectively. The fiber of $\mathcal{L}^{(j)}$ at p is denoted by $\mathcal{L}^{(j)}_p$.

Definition 8.13. We define

$$CF((L^{(1)},\rho),(L^{(0)},\rho);\Lambda_0)=\bigoplus_{p\in L^{(1)}\cap L^{(0)}}Hom(\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_p,\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_p)\otimes_{\mathbb{C}}\Lambda_0.$$

With elements $p\in L^{(1)}\cap L^{(0)}$ equipped with the degree 0 or 1 according to the parity of Maslov index, it becomes a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded free Λ_0-module.

Remark 8.14. Actually we need to fix E_0 and construct $\mathfrak{q}_{\beta;k,\ell}$ for $\beta\cap\omega<E_0$. We then take inductive limit. We omit the detail and refer Proposition 7.4.17 [FOOO3]. For the application we can use $A_{n,K}$ structure in place of A_∞ structure so the process to go to inductive limit is not necessary. See also the end of the proof of Proposition 8.22.

We are now ready to define an operator $\mathfrak{r}$, following section 3.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13.8 [FOOO2]). We first define the map

$${\rm Comp}:\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q)\times Hom(\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_p,\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_p)\to Hom(\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_q,\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_q).$$

Let $B = [\varphi] \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$, $\sigma \in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})$. The restriction of φ to $\mathbb{R} \times \{j\}$, $\tau \mapsto \varphi(\tau, j)$ defines a path joining p to q in $L^{(j)}$ for each $j = 0$, 1. Let

$$\mathrm{Pal}_{\partial_j B} : \mathcal{L}_p^{(j)} \to \mathcal{L}_q^{(j)} \tag{8.14}$$

be the parallel transport along this path with respect to the flat connection ∇. Since ∇ is flat this is independent of the choice of the representative φ but depends only on B. We define

$$\mathrm{Comp}(B, \sigma) = \mathrm{Pal}_{\partial_1 B} \circ \sigma \circ \mathrm{Pal}_{\partial_0 B}^{-1}. \tag{8.15}$$

Lemma 8.15. *Let* $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$, $B' \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; q, r)$ *and* $\beta_j \in \pi_2(X, L^{(j)})$, $\sigma \in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})$. *Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Comp}(B \# B', \sigma) &= \mathrm{Comp}(B', \mathrm{Comp}(B, \sigma)), \\
\mathrm{Comp}(\beta_0 \# B, \sigma) &= \rho(\beta_0)\mathrm{Comp}(B, \sigma), \\
\mathrm{Comp}(B \# \beta_1, \sigma) &= \rho(\beta_1)\mathrm{Comp}(B, \sigma).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is easy and so omitted.

Definition 8.16. Let $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$, $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$ and let $h_i^{(j)}$ $(i = 1, \dots, k_j)$ be differential forms on $L^{(j)}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{r}_{\rho,k_1,k_0;\ell;B}(D(\mathbf{p}); h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_{k_1}^{(1)}; \sigma; h_1^{(0)}, \dots, h_{k_0}^{(0)}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\ell!} T^{\omega \cap B/2\pi} \mathrm{Comp}(B, \sigma) \int_{\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B; \mathbf{p})} ev^{(1)*} h^{(1)} \wedge ev^{(0)*} h^{(0)} \\
&\in Hom(\mathcal{L}_q^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_q^{(1)}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \Lambda_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.16}$$

Here

$$h^{(j)} = h_1^{(j)} \times \cdots \times h_{k_j}^{(j)}$$

is a differential form on $(L^{(j)})^{k_j}$.

$$\mathfrak{r}_{\rho,k_1,k_0;\ell} = \sum_B \mathfrak{r}_{\rho,k_1,k_0;\ell;B}$$

converges in non-Archimedean topology by the energy estimate (see subsection 5.3.5 [FOOO3] = section 22.5 [FOOO2]) and defines

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{r}_{\rho,k_1,k_0;\ell} : E_\ell \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)[2] &\otimes B_{k_1}((\Omega(L^{(1)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \\
&\otimes CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0) \otimes B_{k_0}((\Omega(L^{(0)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \\
&\longrightarrow CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0).
\end{aligned}$$

The following is a slight modification of Theorem 3.8.71 [FOOO3] (= Theorem 13.71 [FOOO2]).

Proposition 8.17. *Let* $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)[2]$, $\mathbf{x} \in B_{k_1}((\Omega(L^{(1)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1])$, *and let* $\mathbf{z} \in B_{k_0}((\Omega(L^{(0)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1])$, $v \in CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0)$. *Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \sum_{c_1, c_2} & (-1)^{\deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;2)} \deg' \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(3;1)} + \deg' \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(3;1)} + \deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;1)}} \\ & \mathfrak{r}_\rho(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;1)}; (\mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(3;1)} \otimes \mathfrak{q}_\rho(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;2)}; \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(3;2)}) \otimes \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(3;3)}) \otimes v \otimes \mathbf{z}) \\ + \sum_{c_1, c_2, c_3} & (-1)^{\deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;2)} \deg' \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(2;1)} + \deg' \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(2;1)} + \deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;1)}} \\ & \mathfrak{r}_\rho(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;1)}; \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(2;1)} \otimes \mathfrak{r}_\rho(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;2)}; \mathbf{x}_{c_2}^{(2;2)} \otimes v \otimes \mathbf{z}_{c_3}^{(2;1)})) \otimes \mathbf{z}_{c_3}^{(2;2)}) \\ + \sum_{c_1, c_3} & (-1)^{(\deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;2)} + 1)(\deg' \mathbf{x} + \deg' v + \deg' \mathbf{z}_{c_3}^{(3;1)}) + \deg \mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;1)}} \\ & \mathfrak{r}_\rho(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;1)}; (\mathbf{x} \otimes v \otimes (\mathbf{z}_{c_3}^{(3;1)} \otimes \mathfrak{q}_\rho(\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^{(2;2)}; \mathbf{z}_{c_3}^{(3;2)}) \otimes \mathbf{z}_{c_3}^{(3;3)})). \end{aligned} \tag{8.17}$$

Proof. The 1st, 2nd and 3rd terms correspond to (2), (1) and (3) of Lemma 8.11 respectively. The associated weights of symplectic area behave correctly under the composition rules in Lemma 8.15. The proposition follows from Stokes' formula. (We do not discuss sign here, since the sign will be trivial for the case of our interest where the degrees of ambient cohomology classes are even and the degrees of the cohomology classes of Lagrangian submanifold are odd.) ☐

Lemma 8.18. *If* $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathbf{x}_2$ *where* 1 *is the degree* 0 *form* 1, *then*

$$\mathfrak{r}_\rho(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x} \otimes v \otimes \mathbf{z}) = 0. \tag{8.18}$$

The same holds if $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2$.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the definition. ☐

We define T^n action on $L^{(1)}$ by

$$g \cdot x = \psi(g\psi^{-1}(x)),$$

where $g\psi^{-1}(x)$ is defined by the T^n action on $L^{(0)}$ induced by T^n action on X. (Note $L^{(1)} \subset X$ is not necessarily T^n invariant under the T^n action on X, since ψ may not be T^n equivariant.)

We also remark that we put ψ^{-1} in the second line of (8.11).

We identify $H(L^{(1)}, \mathbb{C})$ with the set of T^n invariant forms, with respect to the above action. Now by restricting (8.16) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{r}_{\rho, k_1, k_0; \ell}^{can} : E_\ell \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)[2] \otimes B_{k_1}(H(L^{(1)}; \Lambda_0)[1]) & \\ \otimes CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0) \otimes B_{k_0}(H(L^{(1)}; \Lambda_0)[1]) & \\ \longrightarrow CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0). & \end{aligned}$$

By definition (8.17), (8.18) hold when $\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ are replaced by $\mathfrak{r}^{can}$ and $\mathfrak{q}^{can}$.

Definition 8.19. Let $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)$, $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u), \Lambda_0)$. We use the notations of Definition 8.1 and define

$$\delta^{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}} : CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0) \to CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda_0)$$

by

$$\delta^{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}}(v) = \mathfrak{r}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes v \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}).$$

By taking a harmonic representative of $\mathfrak{x}_+$ we also have

$$\delta^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}(v) = \mathfrak{r}_\rho(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes v \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}).$$

Lemma 8.20.

$$\delta^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}} \circ \delta^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}} = 0.$$

Proof. We remark that $\Delta e^{\mathfrak{b}} = e^{\mathfrak{b}} \otimes e^{\mathfrak{b}}$ and $\Delta e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} = e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}$. Therefore Proposition 8.17 implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& \mathfrak{r}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes \mathfrak{r}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes v \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}) \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}) \\ &+ \mathfrak{r}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes \mathfrak{q}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}) \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes v \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}) \\ &+ (-1)^{\deg v+1} \mathfrak{r}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes v \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes \mathfrak{q}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}) \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathfrak{q}_\rho^{can}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+})$ is a (harmonic) form of degree 0, Lemma 8.18 implies that the second and the third terms vanish. This proves the lemma. ☐

Definition 8.21.

$$HF((L^{(1)}, \mathfrak{b}, \psi_*(\mathfrak{x})), (L^{(0)}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda_0) = \frac{\text{Ker } \delta^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}}{\text{Im } \delta^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}}.$$

We recall we are considering the Hamiltonian isotopic pair

$$L^{(0)} = L(u), \quad L^{(1)} = \psi(L(u)).$$

For this case, we prove

Proposition 8.22. *We have*

$$HF((L^{(1)}, \mathfrak{b}, \psi_*(\mathfrak{x})), (L^{(0)}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda) \cong HF((L(u), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}), (L(u), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda).$$

Remark 8.23. We use Λ coefficients instead of Λ_0 coefficients in Proposition 8.22.

Remark 8.24. In the proof of Proposition 8.22, we need to choose a system of multisections of various moduli spaces. In doing so, we need to fix the energy level E_0 and restrict the construction to the moduli spaces with energy smaller than E_0.

In the situation of the proof of Proposition 8.22 this point is slightly more nontrivial than the similar problem mentioned in Remarks 6.10, 8.14, since we need to work with Novikov field Λ instead of Λ_0.

To simplify the description we ignore this problem for a while and will explain it at the end of the proof of Proposition 8.22.

Proof. We can prove Proposition 8.22 by the same way as in sections 3.8, 5.3, 7.4 of [FOOO3] (= sections 13, 22, 32 of [FOOO2]). We will give the detail of the proof using de Rham theory, for completeness. Let ψ_t be a Hamiltonian isotopy such that ψ_0 is the identity and ψ_1 is ψ. We put $L^{(t)} = \psi_t(L(u))$.

Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $\chi(\tau) = 0$ for τ sufficiently small and $\chi(\tau) = 1$ for τ sufficiently large. We choose a two-parameter family of compatible almost complex structures $\{J_{\tau,t}\}_{\tau,t}$ by

$$J_{\tau,t} = \psi_{t\chi(\tau)}^* J.$$

Then it satisfies the following:

1. $J_{\tau,t} = J_t$ for sufficiently large τ.
2. $J_{\tau,t} = J$ for sufficiently small τ.
3. $J_{\tau,1} = \psi_{\chi(\tau)*} J$.
4. $J_{\tau,0} = J$.

Let $p \in L^{(0)} \cap L^{(1)}$. We consider maps $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \to X$ such that

(1) $\lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \varphi(\tau, t) = p$.
(2) $\lim_{\tau \to -\infty} \varphi(\tau, t)$ converges to a point in $L^{(0)}$ independent of t.
(3) $\varphi(\tau, 0) \in L^{(0)}$, $\varphi(\tau, 1) \in L^{(\chi(\tau))}$.

We denote by $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p)$ the set of homotopy classes of such maps. There are obvious maps

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, q), \\
&\pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p), \\
&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p) \times \pi_2(X; L^{(0)}) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.19}$$

(We here use the fact that the action of $\pi_1(L^{(i)})$ on $\pi_2(X; L^{(i)})$ is trivial.) We denote (8.19) by $\#$.

Definition 8.25. We consider the moduli space of maps satisfying (1) - (3) above and of homotopy class $C_+ \in \pi_2(L^{(0)}, L^{(1)}; *, p)$ and satisfying the following equation:

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau} + J_{\tau,t}\left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}\right) = 0. \tag{8.20}$$

We denote it by

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{reg}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C_+).$$

We also consider the moduli spaces with maps with interior and boundary marked points and their compactifications. We then get the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C_+).$$

We remark that we do not divide by $\mathbb{R}$ action since (8.20) is not invariant under the translation. We can define an evaluation map

$$ev = (ev^{\text{int}}, ev^{(1)}, ev^{(0)}) : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C_+) \to X^\ell \times (L^{(1)})^{k_1} \times (L^{(0)})^{k_0},$$

in a similar way as (8.11) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&ev_i^{(0)}(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\}) = \varphi((\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)), \\
&ev_i^{(1)}(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\}) = \psi_{\chi(\tau_i)}^{-1}(\varphi((\tau_i^{(1)}, 1))), \\
&ev_i^{\text{int}}(\varphi, \{(\tau_i^{(1)}, 1)\}, \{(\tau_i^{(0)}, 0)\}, \{(\tau_i, t_i)\}) = \psi_{t_i\chi(\tau_i)}^{-1}(\varphi((\tau_i, t_i))).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.21}$$

Moreover there is another evaluation map

$$ev_{-\infty} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C_+) \to L(u)$$

defined by

$$ev_{-\infty}(\varphi) = \lim_{\tau \to -\infty} \varphi(\tau, t).$$

Using fiber product with the cycle $D(\mathbf{p})$ we define $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C_+; \mathbf{p})$ in the same way as above.

Lemma 8.26. *$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C_+; \mathbf{p})$ has an oriented Kuranishi structure with boundary. Its boundary is a union of the following four types of fiber products as the space with Kuranishi structure.*

(1)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,q;C'_+;\mathbf{p}_1)\times\mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell''}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};q,p;B'';\mathbf{p}_2).$$
Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (1) *and* (*8.13*).

(2)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+1;\ell'}(L(u);\beta';\mathbf{p}_1)\ {}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_i^{(1)}}\ \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0;\ell''}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p;C''_+;\mathbf{p}_2).$$
Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (2) *and* (*8.13*).

(3)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p;C'_+;\mathbf{p}_1)\ {}_{ev_i^{(0)}}\times_{ev_0}\ \mathcal{M}_{k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u);\beta'';\mathbf{p}_2).$$
Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (3) *and* (*8.13*).

(4)
$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+k_0'+1;\ell'}(L(u);\beta';\mathbf{p}_1)_{ev_0}\times_{ev_{-\infty}}\mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell'}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p;C''_+;\mathbf{p}_2),$$
where $k_j'+k_j''=k_j$, $\ell'+\ell''=\ell$, $\beta'\#C''_+=C_+$ *and* (*8.13*).

The proof is the same as one in [FOOO3] subsection 7.1.4 (= [FOOO2] section 29.4).

Lemma 8.27. *There exists a system of multisections on* $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p;C_+;\mathbf{p})$ *so that it is compatible with one constructed before at the boundaries described in Lemma 8.26.*

Proof. We can still use the fact ev_0 is a submersion on the perturbed moduli space to perform the inductive construction of multisection in the same way as the proof of Lemma 8.12. □

For $C_+\in\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p)$, we define $\rho(C_+)\in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)},\mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})$ by
$$\rho(C_+)=\mathrm{Pal}_{\partial_1C_+}\circ\mathrm{Pal}^{-1}_{\partial_0C_+}. \tag{8.22}$$
Here we use the notation of (8.14).

Lemma 8.28. *Let* $C_+\in\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p)$, $B'\in\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};p,q)$ *and* $\beta_j\in\pi_2(X,L^{(j)})$. *Then we have*
$$\mathrm{Comp}(B',\rho(C_+))=\rho(C_+\#B'),$$
$$\rho(\beta_0\#C_+)=\rho(\beta_0)\rho(C_+),\quad\rho(C_+\#\beta_1)=\rho(\beta_1)\rho(C_+).$$

The proof is easy and is left to the reader.

Now let $C_+\in\pi_2(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p)$, $\mathbf{p}\in Map(\ell,\underline{B})$ and let $h_i^{(j)}$ $(i=1,\dots,k_j)$ be differential forms on $L^{(j)}$ and h also a differential form on $L(u)$. We define
$$\begin{aligned}&\mathfrak{f}_{k_1,k_0;\ell;C_+}(SD(\mathbf{p});h_1^{(1)},\dots,h_{k_1}^{(1)};h;h_1^{(0)},\dots,h_{k_0}^{(0)})\\&=\frac{1}{\ell!}\rho(C_+)\int_{\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)},L^{(0)};*,p;C_+;\mathbf{p})}ev^{(1)*}h^{(1)}\wedge ev_{-\infty}^*h\wedge ev^{(0)*}h^{(0)}\\&\in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)},\mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})\otimes\Lambda.\end{aligned}\tag{8.23}$$

Here
$$h^{(j)}=h_1^{(j)}\times\cdots\times h_{k_j}^{(j)}$$

is a differential form on $(L^{(j)})^{k_j}$. It induces

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{f}_{C_+} : B((\Omega(L^{(1)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \otimes (\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda)[1] \otimes B((\Omega(L^{(0)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \\ \to \bigoplus_{p\in L^{(1)}\cap L^{(0)}} Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)}) \otimes \Lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Now we define

$$\mathfrak{f} : \Omega(L(u)) \otimes \Lambda \to CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda)$$

by

$$\mathfrak{f}(h) = \sum_{C_+} T^{\omega\cap C_+/2\pi} \mathfrak{f}_{C_+}(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes h \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}). \tag{8.24}$$

We remark that $\omega \cap C_+/2\pi$ may not be positive in this case since (8.20) is τ-dependent.

The fact that the right hand side converges in non-Archimedean topology follows from the energy estimate. See subsection 5.3.5 [FOOO3] (= section 22.5 [FOOO2]).

Lemma 8.29. *$\mathfrak{f}$ is a chain map.*

Proof. With Lemmata 8.26, 8.27, 8.28, the proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 8.17 and Lemmata 8.18, 8.20. □

We next define the chain map of the opposite direction. Let $p \in L^{(0)} \cap L^{(1)}$. We consider maps $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \to X$ such that

(1) $\lim_{\tau\to-\infty} \varphi(\tau, t) = p$.
(2) $\lim_{\tau\to+\infty} \varphi(\tau, t)$ converges to a point in $L^{(0)}$ and is independent of t.
(3) $\varphi(\tau, 0) \in L^{(0)}$, $\varphi(\tau, 1) \in L^{(\chi(-\tau))}$.

We denote by $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *)$ the set of homotopy classes of such maps. There are obvious maps

$$\begin{aligned}&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; q, *) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *),\\ &\pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *),\\ &\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *) \times \pi_2(X; L^{(0)}) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *).\end{aligned} \tag{8.25}$$

We denote them by #.

Definition 8.30. We consider the moduli space of maps satisfying (1) - (3) above and of homotopy class $C_- \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *)$ and satisfying the following equation:

$$\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\tau} + J_{-\tau,t}\left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}\right) = 0. \tag{8.26}$$

We denote it by

$$\mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-).$$

We include interior and boundary marked points and compactify it. We then get the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-)$.

We define the evaluation maps

$$ev = (ev^+, ev^{(1)}, ev^{(0)}) : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-) \to X^\ell \times (L^{(1)})^{k_1} \times (L^{(0)})^{k_0},$$

and

$$ev_{+\infty} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-) \to L(u).$$

Here

$$ev_{+\infty}(\varphi) = \lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \varphi(\tau, t).$$

Using ev^+ we take fiber product with $D(\mathbf{p})$ and obtain $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-; \mathbf{p})$.

Lemma 8.31. *$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-; \mathbf{p})$ has an oriented Kuranishi structure with boundary. Its boundary is a union of the following four types of fiber product as a space with Kuranishi structure.*

(1)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B'; \mathbf{p}_1) \times \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; q, *; C''_-; \mathbf{p}_2).$$

Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (1) *and* (*8.13*).

(2)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+1;\ell'}(L(u); \beta'; \mathbf{p}_1) \ {}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_i^{(1)}} \ \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0;\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C''_-; \mathbf{p}_2).$$

Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (2) *and* (*8.13*).

(3)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C'_-; \mathbf{p}_1) \ {}_{ev_i^{(0)}}\times_{ev_0} \ \mathcal{M}_{k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u); \beta''; \mathbf{p}_2).$$

Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (3) *and* (*8.13*).

(4)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C'_-; \mathbf{p}_1)_{ev_{-\infty}} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{k_1''+k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u); \beta''; \mathbf{p}_2),$$

where $k_j' + k_j'' = k_j$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $\beta' \# C''_- = C_-$ and (*8.13*).

The proof is the same as one in subsection 7.1.4 [FOOO3] (= section 29.4 [FOOO2]).

We define the map

$$\mathrm{Comp} : \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *) \times Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)}) \to \mathbb{C}$$

as follows. Let $\sigma \in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})$ and $C_- \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *)$. Then

$$\mathrm{Comp}(C_-, \sigma)v = \mathrm{Pal}_{\partial_1 C_-} \circ \sigma \circ \mathrm{Pal}_{\partial_0 C_-}^{-1}(v), \tag{8.27}$$

where $v \in \mathcal{L}_{\lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \varphi(\tau,t)}$ and we use the notation of (8.14).

Let $\sigma \in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})$, $C_- \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; q, *)$, $B' \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ and $\beta_j \in \pi_2(X, L^{(j)})$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Comp}(B', \mathrm{Comp}(C_-, \sigma)) &= \mathrm{Comp}(B' \# C_-, \sigma), \\ \mathrm{Comp}(\beta_0 \# C_-, \sigma) &= \rho(\beta_0)\mathrm{Comp}(C_-, \sigma), \\ \mathrm{Comp}(C_- \# \beta_1, \sigma) &= \rho(\beta_1)\mathrm{Comp}(C_-, \sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{8.28}$$

Now let $C_- \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *)$, $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$ and $h_i^{(j)}$ $(i = 1, \dots, k_j)$ be differential forms on $L^{(j)}$ and $\sigma \in Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)})$. We will define an element

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\ell;k_1,k_0;C_-}(SD(\mathbf{p}); h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_{k_1}^{(1)}; \sigma; h_1^{(0)}, \dots, h_{k_0}^{(0)}) \in \Omega(L(u)) \otimes \Lambda. \tag{8.29}$$

We will define it as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{g}_{\ell;k_1,k_0;C_-}(SD(\mathbf{p}); h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_{k_1}^{(1)}; \sigma; h_1^{(0)}, \dots, h_{k_0}^{(0)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell!}\mathrm{Comp}(C_-, \sigma)((ev_{+\infty})_!)(ev^{(1)*}h^{(1)} \wedge ev^{(0)*}h^{(0)}). \end{aligned} \tag{8.30}$$

Here $(ev_{+\infty})_!$ is the integration along the fiber of the map

$$ev_{+\infty} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}} \to L(u) \tag{8.31}$$

of the appropriately perturbed moduli space. More precise definition is in order.

We can inductively define a multisection on $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-; \mathbf{p})$ so that this is transversal to 0 and is compatible with other multisections we have constructed in the earlier stage of induction. We can prove it in the same way as Lemma 8.27.

However it is impossible to make the evaluation map (8.31) a submersion in general by the obvious dimensional reason if we just use multisections over the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-; \mathbf{p})$: We need to enlarge the base by considering a *continuous family* of multisections. This method was introduced in section 7.5 [FOOO3] (= section 33 [FOOO2]) for example and the form we need here is detailed in section 12 [Fu3]. We recall the detail of this construction in Appendix of the present paper for readers' convenience. More precisely we take $M_s = L(u)^{k_0+k_1}$, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C_-; \mathbf{p})$, $M_t = L(u)$, $ev_s = (ev^{(1)}, ev^{(0)})$, $ev_t = ev_{+\infty}$ and apply Definition 12.11. Then, the next lemma follows from Lemma 12.14 in Appendix.

Lemma 8.32. *There exists a continuous family $\{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha\}$ of multisections on our moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; \beta; \mathbf{p})$ so that it is compatible in the sense of Definition 12.8 and is also compatible with the multisections constructed before in the inductive process at the boundaries described in Lemma 8.31. Moreover* (*8.31*) *is a submersion.*

By Definition 12.11, the integration along the fiber (8.30) (or smooth correspondence map) is defined. Now we have finished the description of the element (8.29). This assignment induces a homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{g}_\beta : B((\Omega(L^{(1)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \otimes \left(\bigoplus_{p \in L^{(1)} \cap L^{(0)}} Hom(\mathcal{L}_p^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(1)}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \Lambda \right) \\ \otimes B((\Omega(L^{(0)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) \to (\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda)[1].\end{aligned}$$

Now we define

$$\mathfrak{g} : CF((L^{(1)}, \rho), (L^{(0)}, \rho); \Lambda) \to \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda$$

by

$$\mathfrak{g}(\sigma) = \sum_\beta T^{\omega \cap C_-/2\pi} \mathfrak{g}_\beta(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes \sigma \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}). \tag{8.32}$$

With these preparation, we can prove the following lemma in the same way as Lemma 8.29 using Lemmata 12.13 and 12.15. So its proof is omitted.

Lemma 8.33. $\mathfrak{g}$ *is a chain map.*

Proposition 8.34. $\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}$ *and* $\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f}$ *are chain homotopic to the identity.*

Proof. We will prove that $\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is chain homotopic to the identity. Let S_0 be a sufficiently large positive number. (Say $S_0 = 10$.) For $S > S_0$ we put

$$\chi_S(\tau) = \begin{cases} \chi(-\tau - S) & \tau \le 0, \\ \chi(\tau - S) & \tau \ge 0. \end{cases}$$

We will extend it to $0 \le S \le S_0$ so that $\chi_0(\tau) = 0$.

We consider maps $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \to X$ such that the following holds:

1. $\lim_{\tau \to -\infty} \varphi(\tau, t)$ converges to a point in $L(u)$ and is independent of t.
2. $\lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \varphi(\tau, t)$ converges to a point in $L(u)$ and is independent of t.
3. $\varphi(\tau, 0) \in L^{(0)}$, $\varphi(\tau, 1) \in L^{(\chi_S(\tau))}$.

We denote by $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S)$ the set of homotopy classes of such maps. There exists a natural isomorphism $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S) \cong \pi_2(X, L(u))$,

$$[\varphi] \mapsto [\varphi'], \qquad \text{where } \varphi'(\tau, t) = \psi^{-1}_{\chi_S(\tau)}(\varphi(\tau, t)).$$

Here we recall $L^{(1)} = \psi_1(L(u))$, $L^{(0)} = L(u)$. Therefore we will denote an element of $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S)$ again by β as for the case of $\pi_2(X, L(u))$.

We have the obvious gluing maps

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; S) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S),\\
&\pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S),\\
&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S) \times \pi_2(X; L^{(0)}) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S)
\end{aligned} \tag{8.33}$$

which we denote all by $\#$.

We consider a three-parameter family of compatible almost complex structures $J_{S,\tau,t}$ given by

$$J_{S,\tau,t} = \psi^*_{t\chi_S(\tau)} J.$$

Then it satisfies:

$$J_{S,\tau,t} = \begin{cases} J_{-\tau-S,t} & \tau \text{ is sufficiently small and } S \geq S_0,\\ J_{\tau-S,t} & \tau \text{ is sufficiently large and } S \geq S_0,\\ J & t = 0,\\ \psi^*_{\chi_S(\tau)} J & t = 1,\\ J & S = 0. \end{cases} \tag{8.34}$$

Definition 8.35. Consider the moduli space of maps satisfying (1) - (3) above and of homotopy class $\beta \in \pi_2(L^{(0)}, L^{(1)}; *, *)$ and satisfying the following equation

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau} + J_{S,\tau,t}\left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}\right) = 0. \tag{8.35}$$

For each $0 \leq S < \infty$, we denote the moduli space by

$$\mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}_S(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta).$$

We also put

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}_{+\infty}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta)\\
&= \bigcup_{p \in L^{(1)} \cap L^{(0)}} \bigcup_{C'_+ \# C''_- = \beta} (\mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; C'_+) \times \mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; C''_-))
\end{aligned}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para) = \bigcup_{S \in [0, +\infty]} (\{S\} \times \mathcal{M}^{\rm reg}_S(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta)).$$

We can also include interior and boundary marked points and compactify the corresponding moduli space which then gives rise to the moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1, k_0; \ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para).$$

We define the evaluation maps

$$ev = (ev^{\mathrm{int}}, ev^{(1)}, ev^{(0)}) : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta) \to X^{\ell} \times (L^{(1)})^{k_1} \times (L^{(0)})^{k_0},$$

and

$$ev_{\pm\infty} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta) \to L(u).$$

Here

$$ev_{\pm\infty}(\varphi) = \lim_{\tau \to \pm\infty} \varphi(\tau, t).$$

Using ev^{int} we take fiber product with $D(\mathbf{p})$ and obtain $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para; \mathbf{p})$.

Lemma 8.36. *$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para; \mathbf{p})$ has an oriented Kuranishi structure with corners. Its boundary is a union of the following six types of fiber products as a space with Kuranishi structure:*

(1)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+1;\ell'}(L(u); \beta'; \mathbf{p}_1) \ {}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_i^{(1)}} \ \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0;\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; para; \beta''; \mathbf{p}_2).$$

Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (2) *and* (*8.13*).

(2)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; para; \beta'; \mathbf{p}_1) \ {}_{ev_i^{(0)}}\times_{ev_0} \ \mathcal{M}_{k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u); \beta''; \mathbf{p}_2).$$

Here the notations are the same as Lemma 8.9 (3) *and* (*8.13*).

(3)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta'; para; \mathbf{p}_1)_{ev_{+\infty}} \times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}_{k_1''+k_0''+1;\ell''}(L(u); \beta''; \mathbf{p}_2),$$

where $k_j' + k_j'' = k_j$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $\beta' \# \beta'' = \beta$ and (*8.13*).

(4)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1'+k_0'+1;\ell'}(L(u); \beta'; \mathbf{p}_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_{-\infty}} \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta''; para; \mathbf{p}_2),$$

where $k_j' + k_j'' = k_j$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $\beta' \# \beta'' = \beta$ and (*8.13*).

(5)

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1',k_0';\ell'}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, p; \mathbf{p}_1; C_+') \times \mathcal{M}_{k_1'',k_0'';\ell''}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, *; \mathbf{p}_2; C_-'')$$

where $k_j' + k_j'' = k_j$, $\ell' + \ell'' = \ell$, $C_+' \# C_-'' = \beta$ and (*8.13*).

(6) *A space $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{k_1+k_0+2;\ell}(L(u); \beta; \mathbf{p})$. There exists an $\mathbb{R}$ action on it such that the quotient space is $\mathcal{M}_{k_1+k_0+2;\ell}(L(u); \beta; \mathbf{p})$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proofs of Lemma 8.31 etc.

We remark that the case $S = \infty$ corresponds to (5).

The case when $S = 0$ corresponds to (6). In fact $\chi_0(\tau, t) = 0$. So the boundary condition reduces $\varphi(\partial(\mathbb{R} \times [0,1])) \subset L(u)$ and the equation (8.35) is J holomorphicity. The τ-translations define an $\mathbb{R}$-action on the moduli space at the part $S = 0$. The quotient space is the moduli space of holomorphic discs with boundary and interior marked points.

To construct a Kuranishi chart in a neighborhood of $S = \infty$, we need to choose a smooth structure of $[0, \infty]$ at ∞. We can do this so that the coordinate change of the Kuranishi structure is smooth using the standard exponential decay estimate: Namely, for a sufficiently large S, every element of $\mathcal{M}_S^{\mathrm{reg}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta)$, together with its S-derivatives, is close to an element of $\mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{\mathrm{reg}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta)$ in the order of Ce^{-cS}. We can prove this estimate in a way similar to the proof of Lemma A1.58 [FOOO3] (= Lemma A1.58 [FOOO2]). □

Lemma 8.37. *There exists a continuous family $\mathfrak{s}$ of multisections on our moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para; \mathbf{p})$ such that it is compatible in the sense of Definition 12.8 and also compatible with the one constructed before in the induction process at the boundaries described in Lemma 8.36. Moreover $ev_{\pm\infty}$ are submersions on the moduli space perturbed by this family.*

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 8.32. □

We use $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S) \cong \pi_2(X, L(u))$ to define $\rho : \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S) \to \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, as the composition

$$\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S) \to \pi_2(X, L(u)) \to \pi_1(L(u)) \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

There is an obvious compatibility relation of this ρ and other ρ's and Comp's we defined before through $\#$.

Now let $\beta \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; S)$, $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. Let $h_i^{(j)}$ $(i = 1, \dots, k_j)$ and h be differential forms on $L^{(j)}$ and on $L(u)$, respectively. We will define an element

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\beta;\ell;k_1,k_0}(SD(\mathbf{p}); h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_{k_1}^{(1)}; h; h_1^{(0)}, \dots, h_{k_0}^{(0)}) \in \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda \tag{8.36}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{h}_{\beta;\ell;k_1,k_0}(SD(\mathbf{p}); h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_{k_1}^{(1)}; h; h_1^{(0)}, \dots, h_{k_0}^{(0)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell!} \rho(\beta) ((ev_{+\infty})_!)(ev^{(1)*} h^{(1)} \wedge ev_{-\infty}^* h \wedge ev^{(0)*} h^{(0)}). \end{aligned} \tag{8.37}$$

Here $(ev_{+\infty})_!$ is the integration along fiber of the map

$$ev_{+\infty} : \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}} \to L(u) \tag{8.38}$$

of our moduli space which is perturbed by the continuous family $\mathfrak{s}$ of perturbations given in Lemma 8.37. More precisely we apply Definition 12.11 to $M_s = L(u)^{k_0+1+k_1}$, $M_t = L(u)$, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_0;\ell}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; *, *; \beta; para; \mathbf{p})$, and $ev_s = (ev^{(1)}, ev_{-\infty}, ev^{(0)})$, $ev_t = ev_{+\infty}$. We then obtain (8.38).

The family of the maps $\mathfrak{h}_{\beta;\ell;k_1,k_0}$ induce a homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_\beta : B((\Omega(L^{(1)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0)[1]) &\otimes (\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda))[1] \\ &\otimes B((\Omega(L^{(0)}) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda_0))[1]) \longrightarrow \Omega(L(u))[1] \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Now we define

$$\mathfrak{h} : \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda \to \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \Lambda$$

by

$$\mathfrak{h}(h) = \sum_\beta T^{\omega \cap \beta / 2\pi} \mathfrak{h}_\beta (e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+} \otimes h \otimes e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}). \tag{8.39}$$

Lemma 8.38. $\mathfrak{h}$ *is a chain homotopy from the identity to* $\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f}$.

Proof. Using Lemma 12.13 we can prove that $d \circ \mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{h} \circ d$ is a sum of terms which are obtained from each of (1) - (6) of Lemma 8.36 in the same way as (8.37), (8.39), as follows.

Using the fact $\mathfrak{q}_\rho(e^{\mathfrak{b}}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+})$ is a harmonic form of degree 0 in the same way as the proof of Lemma 8.20, we can show that the contributions of (1) and (2) vanish. The contributions of (3) and (4) are

$$(\mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}} - d) \circ \mathfrak{h}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{h} \circ (\mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}} - d)$$

respectively. The contribution of (5) is $\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f}$. The contribution of (6) vanishes in the case when $\beta \neq 0$, because of extra $\mathbb{R}$ symmetry. The case $\beta = 0$ gives rise to the identity.

In sum, we use Stokes' formula to conclude

$$\mathfrak{h} \circ \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}} + \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}} \circ \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f} - id.$$

We use the composition formula in Appendix (Lemma 12.15) to prove the above formulae. The proof of Lemma 8.38 is now complete. □

We have thus proved that $\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is chain homotopic to the identity. We can prove $\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}$ is chain homotopic to identity in the same way. The proof of Proposition 8.34 is now complete. □

We now explain the point mentioned in Remark 8.24.

We take a sequence $E_0 < E_1 < \cdots$ with $E_i \to \infty$ and then use a system of (continuous family of) multisections of the moduli spaces with energy $< E_i$ to obtain

$$\mathfrak{f}_{E_i} : \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \frac{\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i}\Lambda_0} \to CF\left((L^{(1)},\rho),(L^{(0)},\rho); \frac{T^{-c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-c}\Lambda_0}\right).$$

Here $\frac{T^{-c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-c}\Lambda_0}$ is a Λ_0 module. (It is not a ring but an abelian group.) The number c is the energy loss (See Definition 5.2.1 [FOOO3] = Definition 21.1 [FOOO2].) c is estimated by Hofer distance of ψ from the identity map (See subsection 5.3.5 [FOOO3] = section 22.5 [FOOO2]) and is in particular independent of E_i.

We can prove that for $j > i$, the homomorphism $\mathfrak{f}_{E_j}$ induces

$$\Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \frac{\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i}\Lambda_0} \to CF\left((L^{(1)},\rho),(L^{(0)},\rho); \frac{T^{-c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-c}\Lambda_0}\right).$$

which is chain homotopic to $\mathfrak{f}_{E_i}$. Therefore we can take projective limit and obtain

$$\mathfrak{f}_{\#} : HF((L(u),\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0) \to HF((L^{(1)},\mathfrak{b},\psi_*(\mathfrak{x})),(L^{(0)},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x});T^{-c}\Lambda_0).$$

We next define

$$\mathfrak{g}_{E_i} : CF\left((L^{(1)},\rho),(L^{(0)},\rho); \frac{\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i}\Lambda_0}\right) \to \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \frac{T^{-c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-c}\Lambda_0}$$

in the same way as $\mathfrak{f}_{E_i}$ and take its projective limit to obtain

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\#} : HF((L^{(1)},\mathfrak{b},\psi_*(\mathfrak{x})),(L^{(0)},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0) \to HF((L(u),\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x});T^{-c}\Lambda_0).$$

We remark that $\mathfrak{g}_{E_i}$ induces

$$CF\left((L^{(1)},\rho),(L^{(0)},\rho); \frac{T^{-c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-c}\Lambda_0}\right) \to \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \frac{T^{-2c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-2c}\Lambda_0}.$$

Therefore we have

$$\mathfrak{g}_{E_i} \circ \mathfrak{f}_{E_i} : \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \frac{\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i}\Lambda_0} \to \Omega(L(u)) \widehat{\otimes} \frac{T^{-2c}\Lambda_0}{T^{E_i-2c}\Lambda_0}.$$

Now we can construct $\mathfrak{h}_{E_i}$ which is a chain homotopy from $\mathfrak{g}_{E_i} \circ \mathfrak{f}_{E_i}$ to the map which is induced by the identity map. Therefore $(\mathfrak{f}_{\#} \circ \mathfrak{g}_{\#}) \otimes_{\Lambda_0} \Lambda$ is the identity map. In the same way $(\mathfrak{g}_{\#} \circ \mathfrak{f}_{\#}) \otimes_{\Lambda_0} \Lambda$ is the identity map. The proof of Proposition 8.22 is complete.

Hence, by using (8.6) also, we have also completed the proof of Proposition 3.15 also. $\square$

Remark 8.39. We gave the proof of the above proposition using de Rham cohomology. In [FOOO3] we gave a proof based on singular cohomology. Strictly speaking we only discussed in the case when $b \in H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+)$ in [FOOO3]. But using Cho's idea of shifting the constant term by non-unitary flat connection, the proof of [FOOO3] can be easily generalized to the present situation of $H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0)$. In fact Theorem 2.5 was proved in section 3.8 or 5.3 [FOOO3] (= section 13 or 22 [FOOO2]) by proving a statement similar to Proposition 8.22 from which we can derive Proposition 3.15. (See also Remark 6.13.)

The approach using de Rham cohomology is shorter but we cannot treat the results with $\mathbb{Q}$-coefficients, at least at the time of writing this article. Therefore we need to use singular homology version for that purpose. It might be possible to develop the $\mathbb{Q}$ de Rham theory for the purpose. We remark that by Lemma 6.8, $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};y_1,\cdots,y_n)$ is defined over the $\mathbb{Q}$ coefficients. To study quantum cohomology $QH(X;\Lambda_0(\mathbb{Q}))$ this de Rham version will be enough.

Proof of Theorem 3.19. This is a straightforward combination of the proofs of Proposition 3.15 and Theorem J [FOOO3]. $\square$

9. Domain of definition of potential function with bulk

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 3.11. Theorem 3.11 is not used in the other part of this paper except in section 11 but will be used in the sequel of this series of papers.

Proof of Theorem 3.11. We recall that $D_1,\dots,D_m$ are of complex codimension one in X and $D_{m+1},\dots,D_B$ are of higher complex codimension. Let $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell,\underline{B})$. We put

$$|\mathbf{p}|_{\rm high} = \#\{j \mid \mathbf{p}(j) > m\}.$$

Lemma 9.1. *For any E we have*

$$\sup\{|\mathbf{p}|_{\rm high} \mid c(\beta,\mathbf{p}) \ne 0,\ \beta\cap\omega < E\} < C(E),$$

where $C(E)$ depends only on E and X. Here the supremum in the left hand side is taken over ℓ and $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell,\underline{B})$.

Proof. If $|\mathbf{p}|_{\rm high} = \mathcal{N}$ and $c(\beta,\mathbf{p}) \ne 0$ then $2\mathcal{N} \le \mu(\beta)$ by the dimension counting. The lemma then follows from Proposition 6.1 (5) and Gromov's compactness. $\square$

We denote by $Map(\ell_+,\underline{B}\setminus\underline{m})$ be the set of the maps $\{1,\dots,\ell_+\} \to \underline{B}\setminus\underline{m} = \{m+1,\dots,B\}$. We put

$$M_+ = \bigcup_{\ell_+} Map(\ell_+,\underline{B}\setminus\underline{m}).$$

For $\mathbf{p}_+ \in Map(\ell_+,\underline{B}\setminus\underline{m})$ and $\ell_1,\dots,\ell_m$ we define $\mathbf{p} = (\ell_1,\dots,\ell_m;\mathbf{p}_+)$ by

$$\mathbf{p}(i) = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } \ell_1+\cdots+\ell_{j-1} < i \le \ell_1+\cdots+\ell_j, \\ \mathbf{p}_+(i-\sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j) & \text{if } i > \sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j. \end{cases} \tag{9.1}$$

Lemma 9.2. *If* $\mathbf{p} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m; \mathbf{p}_+)$ *then*

$$c(\mathbf{p}; \beta) = c(\mathbf{p}_+; \beta) \prod_{i=1}^{m} (\beta \cap D_i)^{\ell_i}.$$

Proof. By the dimensional reason

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{1,|\mathbf{p}_+|}(L(u); \beta; \mathbf{p}_+) = n$$

and $c(\mathbf{p}_+; \beta)$ is the degree of the map

$$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{1,|\mathbf{p}_+|}(L(u); \beta; \mathbf{p}_+) \to L(u). \tag{9.2}$$

Note $\mathcal{M}_{1,|\mathbf{p}_+|}(L(u); \beta; \mathbf{p}_+)$ after perturbation is a space with triangulation and the weight in $\mathbb{Q}$, which is defined by the multiplicity and the order of the isotropy group. So it has a fundamental cycle over $\mathbb{Q}$.

We fix a regular value $p_0 \in L(u)$ of (9.2). Let

$$ev_0^{-1}(p_0) = \{\varphi_j \mid j = 1, \dots, K\}$$

be its preimage. Each of its elements contributes to $c(\mathbf{p}_+; \beta)$ by $\epsilon_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that $\sum \epsilon_j = c(\mathbf{p}_+; \beta)$.

We remark that our counting problem to calculate $c(\mathbf{p}; \beta)$ is well-defined in the sense of Lemma 6.8. Therefore we can perform the calculation in the homology level using Lemma 6.5 (3) to find that each of φ_j contributes $\epsilon_j \prod_{i=1}^{m} (\beta \cap D_i)^{\ell_i}$ to $c(\mathbf{p}; \beta)$. The lemma follows. □

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 3.11. By Lemmata 7.1, 9.2 and 6.5 (6) and Formula (7.2), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{PO}^u(w_1, \dots, w_B; \mathfrak{x}) \\
&= \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\mathbf{p}_+ \in M_+} \sum_{\ell_1, \cdots, \ell_m} \left(\frac{(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_m + |\mathbf{p}_+|)!}{\ell_1! \cdots \ell_m! |\mathbf{p}_+|!} \right) \frac{w_{\mathbf{p}_+(1)} \cdots w_{\mathbf{p}_+(|\mathbf{p}_+|)}}{(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_m + |\mathbf{p}_+|)!} \\
&\qquad T^{\beta \cap \omega / 2\pi} c(\mathbf{p}_+; \beta) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} (\beta \cap D_i)^{\ell_i} \right) w_1^{\ell_1} \cdots w_m^{\ell_m} \exp(\partial \beta \cap \mathfrak{x}) \qquad (9.3) \\
&= \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\mathbf{p}_+ \in M_+} \frac{c(\mathbf{p}_+; \beta)}{|\mathbf{p}_+|!} w_{\mathbf{p}_+(1)} \cdots w_{\mathbf{p}_+(|\mathbf{p}_+|)} T^{\beta \cap \omega / 2\pi} \\
&\qquad \mathfrak{w}_1^{\beta \cap D_1} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{\beta \cap D_m} y_1(u)^{\partial \beta \cap \mathbf{e}_1} \cdots y_n(u)^{\partial \beta \cap \mathbf{e}_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 9.1 this series converges on $\mathfrak{v}_T^u$-adic topology for any $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$.

Remark 9.3. In the second equality in (9.3), beside the identity

$$\exp(\partial \beta \cap \mathfrak{x}) = y_1(u)^{\partial \beta \cap \mathbf{e}_1} \cdots y_n(u)^{\partial \beta \cap \mathbf{e}_n},$$

we also use the definition of $\mathfrak{w}_i$

$$\mathfrak{w}_i := \exp w_i = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{w_i^k}{k!}. \tag{9.4}$$

(See the line right above (3.8).) If we replace the formal variable w_i by a number $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{w}_i$ by $\mathfrak{c}_i = e^{c_i} \in \mathbb{C}$, then the second equality (9.3) still holds. However the convergence in the left hand side of

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{c_i^k}{k!} = \mathfrak{c}_i$$

is with respect to the usual Archimedean topology of $\mathbb{C}$ and is *not* with respect to the non-Archimedean topology we are using here.

Now we examine the dependence of this sum on u's. Firstly, through the isomorphism $\psi_u : H^*(T^n;\mathbb{Z}) \to H^*(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$, we may regard β or β_j are independent of u and so are the coefficients a_j's. Secondly by the structure theorem, Proposition 6.1, the moduli spaces associated to a given β are all isomorphic and so can be canonically identified when $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$ varies. Thirdly the two factors $T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}$ and $y_1(u)^{\partial\beta\cap\mathbf{e}_1}\cdots y_n(u)^{\partial\beta\cap\mathbf{e}_n}$ depending on u can be combined into

$$T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}y_1(u)^{\partial\beta\cap\mathbf{e}_1}\cdots y_n(u)^{\partial\beta\cap\mathbf{e}_n} = \prod_{j=1}^{m}(z_j(u))^{a_j}$$

where $\beta = \sum a_j\beta_j$ in $H_2(X,L(u))$ and then Lemma 3.7 showed that $z_j(u)\circ\psi_u$ are independent of $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$. Therefore the composition $\mathfrak{PO}^u \circ \psi_u$ is independent of u's. This proves Theorem 3.11 (1). We denote the common function by $\mathfrak{PO}$.

Now if we regard $\mathfrak{PO}$ as a a function defined on $\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)\times H^1(T^n;\Lambda_0)$, we can easily derive from the expression (9.3) that $\mathfrak{PO}$ lies in $\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle \mathfrak{w},\mathfrak{w}^{-1},w,y,y^{-1}\rangle\rangle$.

The proofs of Theorem 3.11 are now complete. □

We recall that X is nef if and only if every holomorphic sphere $w : S^2 \to X$ satisfies $w_*[S^2]\cap c_1(X) \ge 0$. In the nef case we can prove the following statement which is somewhat similar to Proposition 4.11.

Proposition 9.4. *If X is nef and $\mathfrak{b}$ is as in (4.10), then we have*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};y) = \sum_{l=1}^{K}\sum_{j=1}^{a(l)} T^{S_l}(\exp(\mathfrak{b}_{l,j})+c_{l,j}(\mathfrak{b}))y^{\vec{v}_{i(l,j)}} + \sum_{i=\mathcal{K}+1}^{m} T^{\ell_i(u)}(1+c_i(\mathfrak{b}))y^{\vec{v}_i}, \quad (9.5)$$

where $c_i(\mathfrak{b}), c_{l,j}(\mathfrak{b}) \in \Lambda_+$.

Proof. Let $\beta \in H_2(X,L(u);\mathbb{Z})$ with $\mu(\beta) = 2$. We assume $\mathcal{M}_{1;\ell}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)$ is nonempty. Let

$$\beta = \sum_{i=1}^{m}k_i\beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_j$$

be as in Proposition 6.1 (5). Since $\alpha_j \cap c_1(X) \ge 0$ by assumption, it follows from the condition $\mu(\beta) = 2$ that there exists unique i such that $k_i = 1$ and other k_i is zero. Moreover $\alpha_j \cap c_1(X) = 0$. Hence if β is not β_i then

$$\beta = \beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_j.$$

This β contributes

$$cT^{\sum_j \alpha_j\cap[\omega]/2\pi}T^{\ell_i(u)}y^{\vec{v}_i},$$

to $\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};y)$. The rest of the proof is the same as the proof of Proposition 4.11. □

10. Euler vector field

The formula (9.3) derived in the previous section yields an interesting consequence which is related to the Euler vector field on a Frobenius manifold and to our potential function. In a sequel of this series of papers, we will further discuss the Frobenius manifold structure on the quantum cohomology and on the Jacobian ring of our potential function and their relationship. (See Remark 10.3.)

For $i = 1, \cdots, B$, let d_i be the degree of $D_i \in \mathcal{A}$. (That is twice of the real codimension of the corresponding faces of P.) In case $d_i = 2$ (that is $i \le m$) we put

$$2r_i = [D_i] \cap \mu_{L(u)} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Here $\mu_{L(u)} \in Hom(\pi_2(X, L(u)); \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z})$ is the Maslov index.

Definition 10.1. We define the *Euler vector field* $\mathfrak{E}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ by

$$\mathfrak{E} = \sum_{i=m+1}^{B} \left(1 - \frac{d_i}{2}\right) w_i \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathfrak{w}_i}.$$

Theorem 10.2. *The directional derivative* $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ *along the vector field* $\mathfrak{E}$ *satisfies*

$$\mathfrak{E}(\mathfrak{PO}^u) = \mathfrak{PO}^u.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of a similar identity for the case of the Gromov-Witten potentials. (See [Dub] for example.) Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{E}_1 &= \sum_{i=m+1}^{B} \left(1 - \frac{d_i}{2}\right) w_i \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i}, \\
\mathfrak{E}_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathfrak{w}_i}, \\
\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\beta,1} &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}_+ \in M_+} \frac{c(\mathbf{p}_+;\beta)}{|\mathbf{p}_+|!} w_{\mathbf{p}_+(1)} \cdots w_{\mathbf{p}_+(|\mathbf{p}_+|)}, \\
\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\beta,2} &= \mathfrak{w}_1^{\beta\cap D_1} \cdots \mathfrak{w}_m^{\beta\cap D_m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\dim \mathcal{M}_{1,|\mathbf{p}_+|}(L(u), \beta; \mathbf{p}_+) = n$, it follows that

$$n - 2 + \mu_{L(u)}(\beta) + \sum_i (2 - \deg \mathbf{p}_+(i)) = n.$$

Therefore

$$\mathfrak{E}_1(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\beta,1}) = \left(1 - \frac{\mu_{L(u)}(\beta)}{2}\right) \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\beta,1}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\mathfrak{E}_2(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\beta,2}) = \frac{\mu_{L(u)}(\beta)}{2} \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\beta,2}$$

by definition. Theorem 10.2 now follows from (9.3). □

Remark 10.3. In a sequel of this series of papers, we will prove the ring isomorphism

$$\Phi : (H(X;\Lambda_0), \cup^{\mathfrak{b}}) \cong \frac{\Lambda_0^P \langle\langle y, y^{-1} \rangle\rangle}{\left(y_i \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_i} : i = 1, \ldots, n\right)}, \tag{10.1}$$

for arbitrary compact toric manifold (which is not necessarily Fano). Here the product $\cup^{\mathfrak b}$ in the left hand side is defined by the formula

$$\langle \mathfrak a_1 \cup^{\mathfrak b} \mathfrak a_2, \mathfrak a_3\rangle_{\rm PD} = \sum_{\alpha\in H_2(X;\mathbb Z)}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\frac{T^{\alpha\cap\omega/2\pi}}{\ell!}GW_{\alpha,\ell+3}(\mathfrak a_1,\mathfrak a_2,\mathfrak a_3,\mathfrak b^{\otimes\ell})$$

where

$$GW_{\alpha,m}(\mathfrak c_1,\dots,\mathfrak c_m) = \int_{\mathcal M_m(\alpha)} ev^*(\mathfrak c_1\times\cdots\times\mathfrak c_m),$$

$\mathcal M_m(\alpha)$ is the moduli space of the stable maps of genus 0 with m marked points in homology class α, and $ev : \mathcal M_m(\alpha)\to X^m$ is the evaluation map. ($\langle,\rangle_{\rm PD}$ denotes the Poincaré duality.)

The isomorphism (10.1) is defined as follows. We choose a lift

$$\bigoplus_{d\neq 0} H^d(X;\Lambda_0)\cong \mathcal H(\Lambda_0)\subset\mathcal A(\Lambda_0).$$

Using its basis $\mathbf f_a$ we write an element of $\mathcal H(\Lambda_0)$ as $\sum_a w_a\mathbf f_a$. Then (10.1) sends $\mathbf f_a$ to

$$\left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial w_a}\mathfrak{PO}\right)(\mathfrak b; y)\right].$$

We can prove that this map is a ring isomorphism by an argument which elaborates the discussion outlined in Remark 6.15 [FOOO4]. We will work it out in detail in a sequel of this series of papers.

We will also prove in a sequel of this series of papers that if $\mathfrak{PO}_{\mathfrak b}$ has only nondegenerate critical point, then (10.1) sends Poincaré duality to the residue pairing. Here the residue pairing is defined, in the case when X is nef and $\deg\mathfrak b = 2$, as follows[1]: By nondegeneracy assumption we have a ring isomorphism

$$\frac{\Lambda_0^P\langle\langle y,y^{-1}\rangle\rangle}{\left(y_i\frac{\partial\mathfrak{PO}_{\mathfrak b}}{\partial y_i} : i=1,\dots,n\right)}\otimes_{\Lambda_0}\Lambda\cong\prod_{p\in{\rm Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_{\mathfrak b})}\Lambda. \tag{10.2}$$

(See Proposition 7.10 [FOOO4]. It can be generalized to the non-Fano case.) Here ${\rm Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_{\mathfrak b})$ is the set of critical points of $\mathfrak{PO}_{\mathfrak b}$. Let 1_p be the unit $\in\Lambda$ in the factor corresponding to p. We then put

$$\langle 1_p, 1_q\rangle_{\rm res} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } p\neq q,\\ (\det {\rm Hess}_p\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b})^{-1} & \text{if } p = q.\end{cases}$$

Here

$${\rm Hess}_p\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b} = \left(\frac{\partial^2\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak b}}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\right)(\mathfrak x)$$

is the Hessian matrix at $\mathfrak x = (\mathfrak x_1,\dots,\mathfrak x_n)$, $e^{\mathfrak x_i} = \mathfrak y_i$, $e^{x_i} = y_i$, and $(T^{u_1}\mathfrak y_1,\dots,T^{u_n}\mathfrak y_n) = p$. Then we have:

$$\langle\mathfrak c,\mathfrak d\rangle_{\rm PD} = \langle\Phi(\mathfrak c),\Phi(\mathfrak d)\rangle_{\rm res} \tag{10.3}$$

The proof of (10.3), which we will give in a sequel of this series of papers, uses the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic annuli bordered to our Lagrangian fiber $L(u)$.

---

[1] See the paper "Lagrangian Floer theory and mirror symmetry on compact toric manifolds I" by Fukaya-Oh-Ohta-Ono (in preparation) for the general case.

In the mean time, here we illustrate the identity (10.3) for the simple case $X = \mathbb{C}P^1$, $\mathfrak{b} = \mathbf{0}$. (See [Ta].) Its moment polytope is $[0,1]$. The potential function is:

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathbf{0}}(y) = T^u y + T^{1-u} y^{-1}.$$

The critical points are given at $u = 1/2$ and $y = \pm 1$. We denote them by p_+, p_- respectively. We have

$$\mathrm{Hess}_{p_+} \mathfrak{PO}^{1/2}_{\mathbf{0}} = 2T^{1/2}, \quad \mathrm{Hess}_{p_-} \mathfrak{PO}^{1/2}_{\mathbf{0}} = -2T^{1/2}.$$

(Note we here take $x = \log y$ as a variable.) Therefore

$$\langle 1_{p_+}, 1_{p_+} \rangle_{\mathrm{res}} = T^{-1/2}/2, \quad \langle 1_{p_-}, 1_{p_-} \rangle_{\mathrm{res}} = -T^{-1/2}/2, \quad \langle 1_{p_+}, 1_{p_-} \rangle_{\mathrm{res}} = 0.$$

We consider $PD[pt] \in H^2(\mathbb{C}P^1)$ and identify it with $[\pi^{-1}(0)]$. Then the isomorphism (10.1) sends $PD[pt]$ to $T^u y \mod \left(y \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_0}{\partial y} \right)$. At $u = 1/2$, the latter becomes $T^{1/2}(1_{p_+} - 1_{p_-})$ in the Jacobian ring, which can be easily seen from the identity

$$T^{1/2} y = \frac{1}{2} \left((1+y) - (1-y) \right) T^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand $PD[\mathbb{C}P^1] \in H^0(\mathbb{C}P^1)$ is the unit and so becomes $1_{p_+} + 1_{p_-}$. We have

$$\langle T^{1/2}(1_{p_+} - 1_{p_-}), 1_{p_+} + 1_{p_-} \rangle_{\mathrm{res}} = 1.$$

This is consistent with the corresponding pairing

$$\langle PD[pt], PD[\mathbb{C}P^1] \rangle_{\mathrm{PD}} = (PD[pt] \cup PD[\mathbb{C}P^1]) \cap [\mathbb{C}P^1] = 1$$

in the quantum cohomology side.

We recall that collection of a product structure on the tangent space, residue pairing, Euler vector field, and the unit consists of the data which determine Saito's flat structure (that is, the structure of Frobenius manifold) [Sa].

11. Deformation by $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$

In sections 4 and 8, we used the bulk deformation of Lagrangian Floer cohomology by the divisor cycles $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_+)$. Actually using the result of section 9, most of the argument there can be generalized to the case where $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$ by a minor modification. In this section we discuss this and some new phenomena appearing in the deformation by $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$.

In this section we consider the case $R = \mathbb{C}$. (See Remark 11.5, however.) We write Λ_0 etc. in place of $\Lambda_0(\mathbb{C})$ etc..

We first remark that the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}(y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}; y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ itself can be defined for $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$ by the formula

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}(y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \sum_{\beta; \ell, k} T^{\beta \cap \omega / 2\pi} \mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\ell, k; \beta}(\mathfrak{b}^{\otimes \ell}; b, \ldots, b),$$

where $b = \sum x_i \mathbf{e}_i$, $y_i = e^{x_i}$. Here the right hand side converges by (9.3). The convergence is a mixture of T adic convergence and the convergence with respect to the usual topology of $\mathbb{C}$. See Remark 9.3.

But the definition of the leading term equation (4.9), Definition 4.3 need some minor modification which is in order. We put

$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum \mathfrak{b}_a D_a \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$$

and consider its zero order term

$$\mathfrak{b}_a \equiv \overline{\mathfrak{b}}_a \mod \Lambda_+$$

where $\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_a \in \mathbb{C}$. We put

$$(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}})_l = \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} \exp(\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_{i(l,r)}) y^{\vec{v}_{l,r}} \in \mathbb{C}[y_{1,1}, \dots, y^{-1}_{l,d(l)}]. \tag{11.1}$$

We define the leading term equation for

$$y_{l,s} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_{l,s}} = 0 \tag{11.2}$$

for $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$ in the same way as Definition 4.3 by using (11.1) in place of (4.6).

We remark that only $\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_a$, $a = 1, \dots, m$ appear in (11.1). In other words, coefficients of the cohomology classes D_a of degree > 2 do not affect the leading term equation.

Lemma 11.1. *Lemma 4.4 holds also for* $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$.

Proof. The formula (9.3) implies that the coefficient of $y^{\vec{v}_{l,r}}$ $(r = 1, \dots, a(l))$ in $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is $T^{S_l} \exp(\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_{i(l,r)})$. The rest of the proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 4.4. □

The leading term equation is of the form

$$0 = \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} \exp(\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_{i(l,r)}) y^{\vec{v}_{l,r}} \vec{v}_{l,r}.$$

By varying $\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_i$ the coefficients $\exp(\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_i)$ can assume all elements from $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Definition 11.2. A system of polynomial equations

$$0 = \sum_{r=1}^{a(l)} C_{i(l,r)} y^{\vec{v}_{l,r}} \vec{v}_{l,r}$$

with $C_{i(l,r)} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $l = 1, \cdots K$ is called a *generalized leading term equation.*

Now Theorem 4.7 is generalized as follows.

Proposition 11.3. *The following two conditions for u are equivalent to each other.*

1. *There exists a generalized leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}^u_0$*, which has a solution* $y_{l,j} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.
2. *There exists* $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$ *such that* $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}$ *has a critical point on* $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^n$.

Proof. (2) ⇒ (1) follows from Lemma 11.1. Let us assume that the generalized leading term equation with $C_{i(l,r)}$ as a coefficient has a solution $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. We put $\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_{i(l,r)} = \log C_{i(l,r)}$. Then we can add higher order term in the same way as the proof of Theorem 4.7 to obtain $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\mathfrak{y}_{l,s}$ is a solution of (11.2). □

Proposition 11.4. *Theorem 3.12 and Proposition 3.15 hold for* $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$.

Proof. The proof goes in the way similar to those of Theorem 3.12 and Proposition 3.15 using (9.3). We however need to modify the definition $\mathfrak{m}^{\mathfrak{b},b}_k$ so that it converges for $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$ as follows.

We remark that (9.3) and Lemma 9.2 are stated only in the case of moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{1,|\mathbf{p}|}(L(u);\beta;\mathbf{p})$ of dimension n, that is the moduli space used to define $\mathfrak{PO}^u(w_1,\dots,w_B;\mathfrak{x})$.

This is because it is cumbersome to appropriately generalize the proofs of Lemma 9.2 for other dimensions. The simplest way to go around this trouble is to make the formula similar to (9.3) as a 'definition' of modified $\mathfrak{q}$ operator, and proceed as follows.

Let $\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,k}$ be the restriction of (6.10) to T^n invariant forms. We divide

$$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}_0 + \mathfrak{b}_{\rm high}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}_0 \in \mathcal{A}^2(\Lambda_0)$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{\rm high} \in \bigoplus_{k>1}\mathcal{A}^{2k}(\Lambda_0)$. We now define

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x},\prime}(x_1,\dots,x_k) = \sum_{\ell,\beta} T^{\beta\cap\mathfrak{b}_0/2\pi}\rho(\partial\beta)\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,*}(\mathfrak{b}_{\rm high}^{\otimes\ell}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}x_1e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}\cdots e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}x_ke^{\mathfrak{x}_+}) \tag{11.3}$$

where we write $\mathfrak{x} = \mathfrak{x}_0 + \mathfrak{x}_+$ and define ρ using $\mathfrak{x}_0$ as in Definition 8.1.

We can prove A_∞ relation for $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x},\prime}$ by using the fact that $\beta \mapsto e^{\beta\cap\mathfrak{b}_0}$ is a homomorphism from $H_2(X,L;\mathbb{Z})$ to $\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$.

(9.3) implies that for $x_i \in H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+)$ we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x},\prime}(x_1,\dots,x_k) = \sum_{\beta,\ell} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}\rho(\partial\beta)\mathfrak{q}^{can}_{\beta;\ell,*}(\mathfrak{b}^{\otimes\ell}; e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}x_1e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}\cdots e^{\mathfrak{x}_+}x_ke^{\mathfrak{x}_+}).$$

Here the right hand side converges by Formula (9.3). In particular

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b};\mathfrak{x}+x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x},\prime}(x,\dots,x).$$

Moreover $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x},\prime}$ converges for any $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$. The proof of this convergence is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.4 given in section 7.

We can use this operator $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x},\prime}$ in place of $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{x}}$. It is then straightforward to see that the proof Theorem 3.12 and Proposition 3.15 go through after minor modification for $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$. □

Remark 11.5. Let R be a field such that $\mathbb{Q} \subset R \subset \mathbb{C}$. Even if we assume $\mathfrak{b} = \sum \mathfrak{b}_a D_a \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0(R))$, it does not imply

$$(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}})_l \in R[y_{1,1},\dots,y_{l,d(l)}^{-1}]. \tag{11.4}$$

In fact $\exp(\overline{\mathfrak{b}}_{i(r,s)})$ may not be an element of R. (This point is related to Remark 9.3.) An appropriate condition for (11.4) to hold is

$$\exp(\mathfrak{b}_i) \in \Lambda_0(R)$$

for $i = 1,\dots,m$.

Example 11.6. We put

$$P = \{(u_1,u_2) \mid 0 \le u_1,u_2,\ u_1+u_2 \le 1,\ u_2 \le 2/3\}.$$

P is a moment polytope of monotone one point blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. We consider $u = (1/3,1/3)$. $L(u)$ is a monotone Lagrangian submanifold. We put

$$D_2 = \pi^{-1}(\{(u_1,u_2) \in P \mid u_2 = 0\}).$$

Let $\mathfrak{b}_c = (\log c)[D_2]$. where $c \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$. Proposition 4.9 implies

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}_c;y_1,y_2) = T^{1/3}(y_1 + cy_2 + y_2^{-1} + (y_1y_2)^{-1}).$$

Thus the critical point is given by

$$1 - y_1^{-2} y_2^{-1} = 0 = c - y_2^{-2} - y_1^{-1} y_2^{-2}.$$

The first equation gives $y_2 = y_1^{-2}$. Hence the second equation becomes

$$c - y_1^4 - y_1^3 = 0. \tag{11.5}$$

(11.5) has a nonzero multiple root $y_1 = -3/4$ if $c = -27/256$.

Namely if $\mathfrak{b} = (\log(-27/256))[D_2]$, then $\mathfrak{PO}^u_{\mathfrak{b}}$ has a degenerate critical point of type A_2.

Example 11.7. We again consider the example of two points blow up in section 5. Namely its moment polytope is (5.1) with $\beta = \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$. We consider the point $u = (\beta, \beta)$. We put $D_2 = \pi^{-1}(\{(u_1, u_2) \in P \mid u_2 = 0\})$, and consider $\mathfrak{b}_c = (\log c)[D_2]$. We have

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{b}_c; y_1, y_2) = T^{\beta}(c y_2 + y_2^{-1} + y_1 + y_1 y_2) + T^{1-\beta} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1}.$$

The (generalized) leading term equation is

$$c - y_2^{-2} + y_1 = 0 = 1 + y_2.$$

It has a nonzero solution $(1 - c, -1)$ if $c \neq 1$. Hence there exists b such that

$$HF((L(u), (\mathfrak{b}_c, b)), (L(u), (\mathfrak{b}_c, b)); \Lambda) \neq 0$$

if and only if $c \neq 1$.

If we deform only by $\mathfrak{b} \in \Lambda_+$ then $c = 1$. Namely there is no such b with nontrivial Floer cohomology. We remark that $L(u)$ is bulk-balanced in the sense of Definition 3.13 since it is a limit of balanced fibers.

The authors do not know an example of $L(u)$ that carries a pair $(\mathfrak{b}, b)$ with $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}(\Lambda_0)$, $b \in H^1(L; \Lambda_0)$ for which we have

$$HF((L(u), (\mathfrak{b}, b)), (L(u), (\mathfrak{b}, b)); \Lambda) \neq 0,$$

but which is not bulk-balanced in the sense of Definition 3.13.

12. Appendix: Continuous family of multisections

In this section we review the techniques of using a continuous family of multisections and integration along the fiber on their zero sets so that smooth correspondence by spaces with Kuranishi structure induces a map between de Rham complex. We used it in section 8.

This technique is not new and is known to various people. In fact [Ru], section 16 [Fu1] use a similar technique and section 7.5 [FOOO3] (= section 33 [FOOO2]), [Fu2], [Fu3] contain almost the same argument as we describe below. We include the details here for reader's convenience.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a space with Kuranishi structure and $ev_s : \mathcal{M} \to M_s$, $ev_t : \mathcal{M} \to M_t$ be strongly continuous smooth maps. (See Definition 6.6 [FO] and the description below.) (Here s and t stand for source and target, respectively.) We assume our smooth manifolds M_s, M_t are compact and oriented without boundary. We also assume $\mathcal{M}$ has a tangent bundle and is oriented in the sense of Kuranishi structure. (See Definition A1.14 [FOOO3] = Definition A1.14 [FOOO2] and the description below.)

Remark 12.1. We may relax the orientability assumption above by using local coefficients in the same way as section A2 [FOOO3] (= section A2 [FOOO2]). We do not discuss it here since we do not need this generalization in this paper.

We include the case when $\mathcal{M}$ has a boundary or corner. We assume that ev_t is weakly submersive. (See A1.13 [FOOO3] (= A1.13 [FOOO2]) and the description below.) In this situation we will construct the map

$$(\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t)_* : \Omega^k M_s \to \Omega^{k+\dim M_t - \dim \mathcal{M}} M_t. \tag{12.1}$$

We call (12.1), the *smooth correspondence map associated to* $(\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t)$.

The space $\mathcal{M}$ is covered by a finite number of Kuranishi charts $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$. They satisfy [FOOO4] Condition B.1.

We assume that $\{(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{A}\}$ is a good coordinate system, in the sense of Definition 6.1 [FO] or Lemma A1.11 [FOOO3] (= Lemma A1.11 [FOOO2]). This means the following: The set $\mathfrak{A}$ has a partial order $<$, where either $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_2 \le \alpha_1$ holds for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ if

$$\psi_{\alpha_1}(s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \cap \psi_{\alpha_2}(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2$. Then, there exists a Γ_{α_1}-invariant open subset $V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \subset V_{\alpha_1}$, a smooth embedding

$$\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \to V_{\alpha_2}$$

and a bundle map

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : E_{\alpha_1}|_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} \to E_{\alpha_2}$$

which covers $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$. Moreover there exists an injective homomorphism

$$\widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : \Gamma_{\alpha_1} \to \Gamma_{\alpha_2}.$$

We require that they satisfy [FOOO4] Conditions B.2, B.3.

A strongly continuous smooth map $ev_t : \mathcal{M} \to M_t$ is a family of Γ_α invariant smooth maps

$$ev_{t;\alpha} : V_\alpha \to M_t \tag{12.2}$$

which induces

$$\overline{ev}_{t;\alpha} : V_\alpha/\Gamma_\alpha \to M_t$$

such that

$$\overline{ev}_{t;\alpha_2} \circ \overline{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \overline{ev}_{t;\alpha_1}$$

on $V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_\alpha$. (Note Γ_α action on M_t is trivial.) $ev_s : \mathcal{M} \to M_s$ consists of a similar family, $ev_{s;\alpha} : V_\alpha \to M_s$.

Our assumption that ev_t is weakly submersive means that each of $ev_{t;\alpha}$ in (12.2) is a submersion.

We next review on the multisections. (See section 3 [FO].) Let $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ be a Kuranishi chart of $\mathcal{M}$. For $x \in V_\alpha$ we consider the fiber $E_{\alpha,x}$ of the bundle E_α at x. We take its l copies and consider the direct product $E_{\alpha,x}^l$. We take the quotient thereof by the action of symmetric group of order $l!$ and let $\mathcal{S}^l(E_{\alpha,x})$ be the quotient space. There exists a map

$$tm_m : \mathcal{S}^l(E_{\alpha,x}) \to \mathcal{S}^{lm}(E_{\alpha,x}),$$

which sends $[a_1, \dots, a_l]$ to

$$[\underbrace{a_1, \dots, a_1}_{m \text{ copies}}, \dots, \underbrace{a_l, \dots, a_l}_{m \text{ copies}}].$$

A smooth *multisection* s of the orbibundle

$$E_\alpha \to V_\alpha$$

consists of an open covering

$$\bigcup_i U_i = V_\alpha$$

and s_i which maps $x \in U_i$ to $s_i(x) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,x})$. They are required to satisfy [FOOO4] Condition B.12.

We identify two multisections $(\{U_i\},\{s_i\},\{l_i\})$, $(\{U'_i\},\{s'_i\},\{l'_i\})$ if

$$tm_{l_j}(s_i(x)) = tm_{l'_i}(s'_j(x)) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i l'_j}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x})$$

on $U_i \cap U'_j$. We say $s_{i,j}$ to be a *branch* of s_i.

We next discuss a continuous family of multisections and their transversality. Let W_α be a finite dimensional smooth oriented manifold and consider the pull-back bundle

$$\pi_\alpha^* E_\alpha \to W_\alpha \times V_\alpha$$

under the projection $\pi_\alpha : W_\alpha \times V_\alpha \to V_\alpha$. The action of Γ_α on W_α is, by definition, trivial.

Definition 12.2.

1. A W_α-parameterized family $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ of multisections is by definition a multisection of $\pi_\alpha^* E_\alpha$.
2. We fix a metric of our bundle E_α. We say $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is ϵ-close to s_α in C^0 topology if the following holds. Let $(w,x) \in W_\alpha \times V_\alpha$. Then for any branch $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ we have
$$|\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}(w,\ldots) - s_\alpha(\ldots)|_{C^0} < \epsilon$$
in a neighborhood of x.
3. $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is said to be transversal to 0 if any branch $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is transversal to 0.
4. Let $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \to M$ be a Γ_α-equivariant smooth map. We assume that $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is transversal to 0. We then say that $f_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion if the following holds: Let $(w,x) \in W_\alpha \times V_\alpha$. Then for any branch $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ the restriction of
$$f_\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha : W_\alpha \times V_\alpha \to M$$
to
$$\{(w,x) \mid \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}(w,x) = 0\} \tag{12.3}$$
is a submersion. We remark that (12.3) is a smooth manifold by our assumption.

Remark 12.3. In case $\mathcal{M}$ has a boundary or a corner, so does (12.3). In this case we require that the restriction of f_α to each of the stratum of (12.3) is a submersion.

Lemma 12.4. *We assume that $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \to M$ is a submersion. Then there exists W_α such that for any ϵ there exists a W_α-parameterized family $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ of multisections which is ϵ close to s_α, transversal to 0 and such that $f_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion.*

If $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is already given and satisfies the required condition on a neighborhood of a Γ_α invariant compact set $K_\alpha \subset V_\alpha$, then we may extend it to the whole V_α without changing it on K_α.

In the course of the proof of Lemma 12.4 we need to shrink V_α slightly. We do not mention it explicitly.

Proof. We may choose W_α to be a vector space of sufficiently large dimension so that there exists a surjective bundle map

$$\mathrm{Sur} : W_\alpha \times V_\alpha \to E_\alpha. \tag{12.4}$$

We remark that (12.4) is not necessarily Γ_α-equivariant. We put

$$\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(1)}(w,x) = \mathrm{Sur}(w,x) + s_\alpha(x).$$

We put

$$\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(2)}(w,x) = [\gamma_1 \mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(1)}(w,x), \dots, \gamma_g \mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(1)}(w,x)]$$

where $\Gamma_\alpha = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g\}$. $\mathfrak{s}^{(2)}$ defines a multisection on $W_\alpha \times V_\alpha$ which is transversal to 0 by construction. Moreover since $(\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(2)})^{-1}(0) \to V_\alpha$ is a submersion it follows from assumption that $f_\alpha|_{(\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(2)})^{-1}(0)}$ is a submersion. By replacing W_α to a small neighborhood of 0, we can choose $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{(2)}$ which is sufficiently close to s_α.

The last part of the lemma can be proved by using an appropriate partition of unity in the same way as section 3 [FO]. □

Now let θ_α be a smooth differential form of compact support on V_α. We assume that θ_α is Γ_α-invariant. Let $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \to M$ be a Γ_α equivariant submersion. (The Γ_α action on M is trivial.) Let $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 12.4. We put a smooth measure ω_α on W_α of compact support with total mass 1. By fixing an orientation on W_α we regard ω_α as a differential form of top degree. We have

$$\int_{W_\alpha} \omega_\alpha = 1. \tag{12.5}$$

We next define *integration along the fiber*

$$((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), (W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha, f_\alpha)_*(\theta_\alpha) \in \Omega^{\deg\theta_\alpha + \dim M - \dim \mathcal{M}}(M).$$

Let $(U_i, \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i})$ be a representative of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$. Namely $\{U_i \mid i \in I\}$ is an open covering of $W_\alpha \times V_\alpha$ and s_α is represented by $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i}$ on U_i. By the definition of the multisection, U_i is Γ_α-invariant. We may shrink U_i, if necessary, so that there exists a lifting $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i} = (\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,1}, \dots, \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,l_i})$ as in [FOOO4] (B.10).

Let $\{\chi_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to the covering $\{U_i \mid i \in I\}$. By replacing χ_i with its average over Γ_α we may assume χ_i is Γ_α-invariant.

We put

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0) = \{(w,x) \in U_i \mid \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}(w,x) = 0\}. \tag{12.6}$$

By assumption $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth manifold and

$$f_\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0)} : \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0) \to M \tag{12.7}$$

is a submersion.

Definition 12.5. We define

$$\begin{aligned}&((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), (W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha, f_\alpha)_*(\theta_\alpha)\\ &= \frac{1}{\#\Gamma_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} \frac{1}{l_i} (f_\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0)})_!((\chi_i \pi_\alpha^* \theta_\alpha \wedge \omega_\alpha)|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0)}).\end{aligned} \tag{12.8}$$

Here $(f_\alpha \circ \pi_\alpha|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0)})_!$ is the integration along the fiber of the smooth submersion (12.7).

Lemma 12.6. *The right hand side of (12.8) depends only on* $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$, $(W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha)$, $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$, f_α, *and* θ_α *but independent of the following choices:*

1. *The choice of representatives* $(\{U_i\}, \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i})$ *of* $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$.
2. *The lifting* $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i}$.
3. *The partition of unity* χ_i.

Proof. The proof is straightforward generalization of the proof of well-definedness of integration on manifold, which can be found in text books of manifold theory, and is left to the reader. ☐

So far we have been working on one Kuranishi chart $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$. We next describe the compatibility conditions among the W_α-parameterized families of multisections for various α. During the construction we need to shrink V_α a bit several times. We will not mention explicitly this point henceforth.

Remark 12.7. The discussion below is a W_α parametrized version of [FOOO4] section C.

Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. For $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, we take the normal bundle $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$ of $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1})$ in V_{α_2}. We use an appropriate Γ_{α_2} invariant Riemannian metric on V_{α_2} to define the exponential map

$$\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : B_\varepsilon N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2} \to V_{\alpha_2}. \tag{12.9}$$

(Here $B_\varepsilon N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$ is the ϵ neighborhood of the zero section of $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$.)

Using $\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$, we identify $B_\varepsilon N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$ to an open subset of $V_{\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$ and denote it by $U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$.

Using the projection

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} : U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \to V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$$

we extend the orbibundle E_{α_1} to $U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$. Also we extend the embedding $E_{\alpha_1} \to \widehat{\varphi}^*_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_2}$, (which is induced by $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$) to $U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$.

We fix a Γ_α-invariant inner product of the bundles E_α. We then have a bundle isomorphism

$$E_{\alpha_2} \cong E_{\alpha_1} \oplus \frac{\widehat{\varphi}^*_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_2}}{E_{\alpha_1}} \tag{12.10}$$

on $U_\varepsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$. We can use [FOOO4] Condition B.3 to modify $\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ in (12.9) so that [FOOO4] Condition C.3 is satisfied.

Let W_{α_1} be a finite dimensional manifold and $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}$ a multisection of $\pi^*_{\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_1}$ on $W_{\alpha_1} \times V_{\alpha_1}$. We put $W_{\alpha_2} = W_{\alpha_1} \times W'$, where W' will be defined later.

Definition 12.8. A multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2}$ of $W_{\alpha_2} \times V_{\alpha_2}$ is said to be *compatible* with $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}$ if the following holds for each $y = \mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(\tilde{y}) \in U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$.

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2}((w,w'),y) = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}(w, \mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y})) \oplus ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1}). \tag{12.11}$$

We remark that $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}(w, \mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y}))$ is a multisection of $\pi^*_{\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_1}$ and $ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1})$ is a (single valued) section. Therefore using (12.10) the right hand side of (12.11) is an element of $\mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha_2})_x$ $(x = \mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y}))$, and hence is regarded as a multisection of $\pi^*_{\alpha_2} E_{\alpha_2}$. In other words, we omit $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ in (12.11).

[FOOO4] Condition C.3 implies that the original Kuranishi map s_α satisfies the compatibility condition (12.11). We use this and (the proof of) Lemma 12.4 and prove the following. Let $ev_t : \mathcal{M} \to M_t$ be a weakly submersive strongly smooth map. We choose a good coordinate system $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ and let $ev_{t,\alpha} : V_\alpha \to M_t$ be a local representative of ev_t.

Lemma 12.9. *We have* W_α *such that for each* ϵ *there exists* $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$*, a* W_α*-parameterized family of multisections with the following properties.*

(1) $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ *is transversal to* 0.
(2) $ev_{t,\alpha}|_{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0)}$ *is a submersion.*
(3) $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ *is* ϵ *close to* s_α.
(4) $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2}$ *is compatible with* $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}$ *for each* $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$.

If $\{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha\}$ *is already defined and satisfies* (1) - (4) *on a neighborhood of a compact set* $K \subset \mathcal{M}$*, then we may choose* $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ *without changing it on* K.

Proof. The proof is by induction on α. (We remark that $\mathfrak{A}$ (the totality of α's) is partially ordered.) For minimal α we use Lemma 12.4 to prove existence of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$. If we have constructed $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha'}$ for every α' smaller than α, then we use (12.11) to define $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ on a neighborhood of the images of $V_{\alpha,\alpha'}$ for various $\alpha' < \alpha$. They coincide on the overlapped part by the induction hypothesis and [FOOO4] Condition B.2. [FOOO4] Condition C.3 then implies that this is still ϵ close to s_α. Therefore we can use Lemma 12.4 (the relative version) to extend it and obtain $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$. (We choose W' at this step.)

The proof of the last statement is similar. □

We choose measures ω_α on W_α such that the measure ω_{α_2} is a direct product measure $\omega_{\alpha_1} \times \omega'$ on $W_\alpha \times W'$ if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$.

We next choose a partition of unity χ_α subordinate to our Kuranishi charts. To define the notion of partition of unity, we need some notation. For $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, we take the normal bundle $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$ of $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1})$ in V_{α_2}. Let $\mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} : N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2} \to V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ be the projection. We fix a Γ_{α_1}-invariant positive definite metric of $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$ and let $\rho_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2} \to [0,\infty)$ be the norm with respect to this metric. (Actually we modify it so that it becomes compatible.) We fix a sufficiently small δ and let $\chi^\delta : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ be a smooth function such that

$$\chi^\delta(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t \ge \delta \\ 1 & t \le \delta/2. \end{cases}$$

Let $U_\delta(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$ be the image of the exponential map. Namely

$$U_\delta(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) = \{\mathrm{Exp}(v) \mid v \in N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1} \mid \rho_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(v) < \delta\}.$$

We push out our function ρ_{α_2,α_1} to $U_\delta(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$ and denote it by the same symbol. It is called a *tubular distance function.* Following [Ma] we assume the following compatibility condition for various tubular neighborhoods and tubular distance functions.

Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3$. We assume the following equalities hold on the domain where both sides are defined.

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} \circ \mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_3,\alpha_2}} = \mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_3,\alpha_1}} \tag{12.12a}$$

$$\rho_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \circ \mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_3,\alpha_2}} = \rho_{\alpha_3,\alpha_1}. \tag{12.12b}$$

The existence of such system is proved in [Ma] in more difficult situation than ours. (See also section 35.2 [FOOO2].)

Let $x \in V_\alpha$. We put

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{A}_{x,+} &= \{\alpha_+ \mid x \in V_{\alpha_+,\alpha},\ \alpha_+ > \alpha\}\\ \mathfrak{A}_{x,-} &= \{\alpha_- \mid [x \mod \Gamma_\alpha] \in U_\delta(V_{\alpha,\alpha_-}/\Gamma_{\alpha_-}),\ \alpha_- < \alpha\}.\end{aligned}$$

For $\alpha_- \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,-}$ we take x_{α_-} such that $\mathrm{Exp}(x_{\alpha_-}) = x$.

Definition 12.10. A system $\{\chi_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{A}\}$ of Γ_α-equivariant smooth functions $\chi_\alpha : V_\alpha \to [0,1]$ of compact support is said to be a partition of unity subordinate to our Kuranishi chart if:

$$\chi_\alpha(x) + \sum_{\alpha_- \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,-}} \chi^\delta(\rho_{\alpha,\alpha_-}(x))\chi_{\alpha_-}(\mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha,\alpha_-}}(x_{\alpha-})) + \sum_{\alpha_+ \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,+}} \chi_{\alpha_+}(\varphi_{\alpha_+,\alpha}(x)) = 1.$$

In [FOOO4] Lemma C.6 we proved the existence of partition of unity subordinate to our Kuranishi chart.

Now we consider the situation we start with. Namely we have two strongly continuous smooth maps

$$ev_s : \mathcal{M} \to M_s, \qquad ev_t : \mathcal{M} \to M_t$$

and ev_t is weakly submersive. Let h be a differential form on M_s. We choose $((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), (W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha)$ which satisfies (1) - (4) of Lemma 12.9. We also choose a partition of unity χ_α subordinate to our Kuranishi chart. We put

$$\theta_\alpha = \chi_\alpha (ev_s \circ \pi_\alpha)^* h \tag{12.13}$$

which is a differential form on $W_\alpha \times V_\alpha$.

Definition 12.11. We define

$$(\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t)_*(h) = \sum_\alpha ((V_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, E_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), (W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha, ev_{t,\alpha})_*(\theta_\alpha). \tag{12.14}$$

This is a smooth differential form on M_t.

Remark 12.12.
1. Actually the right hand side of (12.14) *depends* on the choice of $((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), (W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha)$. We write $\mathfrak{s}$ to demonstrate this choice and write $(\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h)$.
2. The right hand side of (12.14) is independent of the choice of partition of unity. The proof is similar to the well-definiedness of integration on manifolds.

In case $\mathcal{M}$ has a boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, the choice $((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), (W_\alpha, \omega_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha)$ on $\mathcal{M}$ induces one for $\partial\mathcal{M}$. We then have the following:

Lemma 12.13 (Stokes' theorem)**.** *We have*

$$d((\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h)) = (\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(dh) + (\partial\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h). \tag{12.15}$$

We will discuss the sign at the end of this section.

Proof. Using the partition of unity χ_α it suffices to consider the case when $\mathcal{M}$ has only one Kuranishi chart V_α. We use the open covering U_i of V_α and the partition of unity again to see that we need only to study on one U_i. In that case (12.15) is immediate from the usual Stokes' formula. ☐

We consider the following situation. We assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a space with Kuranishi structure with corners. Let $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$, $c = 1, \cdots, C$ be a decomposition of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ into components. The intersection $\partial_c\mathcal{M} \cap \partial_{c'}\mathcal{M}$ is a codimension 2 stratum of $\mathcal{M}$ if it is nonempty. We denote it by $\partial_{cc'}\mathcal{M}$. (Actually there may be a case where there is a self intersection of $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$ with itself. If it occurs there is a codimension 2 stratum of $\mathcal{M}$ corresponding to the self intersection points. We write it as $\partial_{cc}\mathcal{M}$.) $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$ is regarded as a space with Kuranishi structure which we denote by the same symbol. (This is slightly imprecise in case there is a self intersection. Since the way to handle it is rather obvious we do not discuss it here.) The boundary of $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$ is the union of $\partial_{cc'}\mathcal{M}$ for various c'. (Actually we include the case $c' = c$. In that case we take two copies of $\partial_{cc}M$, which become components of the boundary of $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$.)

Now we have the following:

Lemma 12.14. *If there exist data $\mathfrak{s}_c$ as in Remark 12.12* (1) *on each of $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$. We assume that the restriction of $\mathfrak{s}_c$ to $\partial_{cc'}\mathcal{M}$ coincides with the restriction of $\mathfrak{s}_{c'}$ to $\partial_{cc'}\mathcal{M}$. We assume a similar compatibility at the self intersection $\partial_{cc}\mathcal{M}$.*

Then there exists a datum $\mathfrak{s}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ whose restriction to $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathfrak{s}_c$ for each c.

Proof. Using the compatibility condition we assumed we can define $\mathfrak{s}$ in a neighborhood of the union $\partial_c\mathcal{M}$ over c. We can then extend it by using Lemma 12.9. □

We next discuss composition of smooth correspondences. We consider the following situation. Let

$$ev_{s;st} : \mathcal{M}_{st} \to M_s, \qquad ev_{t;st} : \mathcal{M}_{st} \to M_t$$

be as before such that $ev_{t;st}$ is weakly submersive. Let

$$ev_{r;rs} : \mathcal{M}_{rs} \to M_r, \qquad ev_{s;rs} : \mathcal{M}_{rs} \to M_s$$

be a similar diagram such that $ev_{s;rs}$ is weakly submersive. We use the fact that $ev_{s;rs}$ is weakly submersive to define the fiber product

$$\mathcal{M}_{rs\ ev_{s;rs}} \times_{ev_{s;st}} \mathcal{M}_{st}$$

as a space with Kuranishi structure. We write it as $\mathcal{M}_{rt}$. We have a diagram of strongly continuous smooth maps

$$ev_{r;rt} : \mathcal{M}_{rt} \to M_r, \qquad ev_{t;rt} : \mathcal{M}_{rt} \to M_t.$$

It is easy to see that $ev_{t;rt}$ is weakly submersive.

We next make choices $\mathfrak{s}^{st}$, $\mathfrak{s}^{rs}$ for $\mathcal{M}_{st}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{rs}$. It is easy to see that it determines a choice $\mathfrak{s}^{rt}$ for $\mathcal{M}_{rt}$.

Now we have:

Lemma 12.15 (Composition formula)**.** *We have the following formula for each differential form h on M_r.*

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathcal{M}_{rt}; ev_{r;rt}, ev_{t;,rt}, \mathfrak{s}^{rt})_*(h)\\ &= ((\mathcal{M}_{st}; ev_{s;st}, ev_{t;,st}, \mathfrak{s}^{st})_* \circ (\mathcal{M}_{rs}; ev_{r;rs}, ev_{s;,rs}, \mathfrak{s}^{rs})_*)(h).\end{aligned} \tag{12.16}$$

Proof. Using a partition of unity it suffices to study locally on $\mathcal{M}_{rs}$, $\mathcal{M}_{st}$. In that case it suffices to consider the case of usual manifold, which is well-known. □

We finally discuss the signs in Lemmas 12.13 and 12.15. It is rather cumbersome to fix appropriate sign convention and show those lemmata with sign. So, instead, we use the trick of subsection 8.10.3 [FOOO3] (= section 53.3 [FOOO2]) (see also section 13 [Fu3]) to reduce the orientation problem to the case which is already discussed in Chapter 8 [FOOO3] (= Chapter 9 [FOOO2]), as follows.

For generic $w \in W_\alpha$, the space $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0) \cap (\{w\} \times U_i)$ is a smooth manifold. Hence the right hand side of (12.8) can be regarded as an average of the correspondence by $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i,j}^{-1}(0) \cap (\{w\} \times U_i)$ over w. We can also represent the smooth form h by an appropriate average (with respect to certain smooth measure) of a family of currents realized by smooth singular chains. So, as far as sign concerns, it suffices to consider a current realized by a smooth singular chain. Then the right hand side of (12.8) turn out to be a current realized by a smooth singular chain which is obtained from a smooth singular chain on M_s by a transversal smooth correspondence. In fact, we may assume that all the fiber products appearing here are transversal, since it suffices to discuss the sign at the generic point where the transversality holds. Thus the problem reduces to find a sign convention (and orientation) for correspondence of the singular chains by a smooth manifold. In the situation of our application, such sign convention (singular homology version) was determined and analyzed in detail in Chapter 8 [FOOO3] (= Chapter 9 [FOOO2]). Especially the existence of an appropriate orientation that is consistent with the sign appearing in A_∞ formulae etc. was proved there. Therefore we can prove that there is a sign (orientation) convention which induces all the formulae we need with sign, in our de Rham version, as well. See subsection 8.10.3 [FOOO3] (= section 53.3 [FOOO2]) or section 13 [Fu3] for detail.

References

[Ber] B.G. Berkovich, Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 33. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.

[BGR] S. Bosch, U. Güntzer and R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean Analysis. A systematic Approach to Rigid Analytic Geometry, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 261, Springer-Verlag, Berline, 1984.

[Cho] C.-H. Cho, *Non-displaceable Lagrangian submanifolds and Floer cohomology with non-unitary line bundle*, J. Geom. Phys. 58 (2008), 1465–1476, arXiv:0710.5454.

[CO] C.-H. Cho and Y.-G. Oh, *Floer cohomology and disc instantons of Lagrangian torus fibers in Fano toric manifolds*, Asian J. Math. 10 (2006), 773-814.

[Dub] B. Dubrovin, *Geometry of 2D topological field theories*, Lecture note in Math. 1620 (1996), 120 - 348.

[Dui] J. J. Duistermaat, *On global action-angle coordinates*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 33 (1980), no. 6, 687–706.

[EP] M. Entov and L. Polterovich, *Calabi quasimorphism and quantum homology,* Int. Math. Res. Not. 2003, no. 30, 1635–1676.

[Fl] A. Floer, *Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections,* J. Differ. Geom. 28 (1988), 513-547.

[Fu1] K. Fukaya, *Mirror symmetry of abelian variety and multi theta function*, J. Algebraic Geom. 11 393–512 2002

[Fu2] K. Fukaya, *Application of Floer homology of Langrangian submanifolds to symplectic topology.* in 'Morse Theoretic Methods in Nonlinear Analysis and in Symplectic Topology", 231–276, NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem., 217, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.

[Fu3] K. Fukaya, *Differentiable operad, Kuranishi correspondence,and Foundation of topological field theories based on pseudo-holomorphic curve*, to appear in 'Arithmetic and Geometry around Quantization', Progr., Math. Birkäuser, 2009.

[FOOO1] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory-anomaly and obstruction,* Kyoto University preprint, 2000.

[FOOO2] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory-anomaly and obstruction,* expanded version of [FOOO1], 2006 & 2007.

[FOOO3] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory-anomaly and obstruction,* AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol 46, Amer. Math. Soc./International Press, 2009.

[FOOO4] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagranaign Floer theory on compact toric manifolds I*, to appear in Duke Math. J., arXiv:0802.1703.

[FO] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, *Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant*, Topology 38 (1999), no. 5, 933–1048.

[Ful] W. Fulton, Introduction to Toric Varieties, Annals of Math. Studies, 131, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993.

[H] H. Hofer, *On the topological properties of symplectic maps*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh 115 (1990), 25-38.

[KL] S. Katz, and C.-C. Liu, *Enumerative geometry of stable maps with Lagrangian boundary conditions and multiple covers of the disc*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 5 (2001), 1–49.

[KS] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Affine structures and non-archimedean analytic spaces*, in: The Unity of Mathematics (P. Etingof, V. Retakh, I. M. Singer, eds), pp 321-385, Progr. Math. 244, Birkhäuser 2006.

[Ma] J. Mather, *Stratifications and mappings.* Dynamical systems (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Bahia, Salvador, 1971) 41. 195–232. Academic Press. New York. 1973.

[OsTy] Y. Ostrover and I. Tyomkin, *On the quantum homology algebra of toric Fano manifolds*, Selecta Math. 15 (2009), 121–149, arXiv:0804.0270.

[Ru] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhood and pseudoholomorphic curve.* Turkish J. Math. (1999), 161–231

[Sa] K. Saito, *Period mapping associated to a primitive form*, Publ. R.I.M.S. 19 (1983), 1231 - 1261.

[Ta] A. Takahashi, *Primitive forms, Topological LG model coupled with gravity, and mirror symmetry*, preprint, arXiv:9802059.

[W] A. Weinstein, *Symplectic manifolds and their Lagrangian submanifolds*, Advances in Math. 6 (1971), 329–346 .

Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
E-mail address: `fukaya@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA and National Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Daeduk Boulevard 628, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon, 305-340, Korea.
E-mail address: `oh@math.wisc.edu`

Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan
E-mail address: `ohta@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp`

Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan
E-mail address: `ono@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp`